

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES

October 27, 2016

The Board of Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22nd Floor, Richmond, with the following members present:

Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr., President
Mrs. Joan E. Wodiska, Vice President
Mrs. Diane T. Atkinson
Dr. Oktay Baysal
Mr. Wesley J. Bellamy

Mr. James H. Dillard
Mr. Daniel A. Gecker
Mrs. Elizabeth V. Lodal
Mr. Sal Romero, Jr.

Dr. Steven R. Staples, Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Dr. Cannaday called the meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Dr. Cannaday asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Atkinson made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 22, 2016, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Dr. Baysal and carried unanimously. Mr. Bellamy was not present for the vote. Copies of the minutes had been distributed in advance of the meeting.

The Board took action to correct a vote from the Wednesday, October 26, 2016, meeting of the Committee of the Standards of Quality. Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 21, 2016, meeting of the Committee of the Standards of Quality (rather than the July 27, 2016, meeting minutes). The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITIONS

Resolutions of Recognition were presented to the following organizations to commemorate November 2016 as Family Involvement in Education Month:

- Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center;
- Center for Family Involvement;
- Virginia PTA;
- Henrico County Public Schools; and

- Hanover County Public Schools.

Resolutions of Recognition were presented to the following school divisions that were awarded the U. S. Department of Education's Green Ribbon School Award:

- Charlottesville City Public Schools; and
- Virginia Beach City Public Schools.

Resolutions of Recognition were presented to the following school divisions that met Governor McAuliffe's Environmental Literacy Challenge for Systemic Sustainability:

- King William County Public Schools; and
- Virginia Beach City Public Schools.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following persons spoke during public comment:

- Kate Grisdale, member of the Virginia Academy of School Psychologists and school psychologist in Page County, spoke on proposed changes to the Standards of Quality
- Jackie Jones, past president of the Virginia Academy of School Psychologists and school psychologist in Prince William County, spoke on proposed changes to the Standards of Quality
- Marie Tucker spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Kevin Koziol, independent living coordinator with the disAbility Resource Center in Fredericksburg, spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Shakthi Ramasamy, a student at George H. Moody Middle School in Henrico County, spoke on health and physical education
- Shelly Montante spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Dr. Rita Bishop, superintendent, Roanoke City Public Schools, spoke on the division's request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School*
- Andrew Larkin, senior program assistant, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), spoke on the Science and Environmental Literacy Diploma Seal
- Heather Luke spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Michael Hasley, representing the Virginia Social Studies Leaders Consortium, spoke on the proposed *Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines*
- Paul Nichols, superintendent, Mecklenburg County Public Schools, representing the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS), spoke on the proposed *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*
- Dr. Rosa Atkins, superintendent, Charlottesville City Public Schools, representing the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS), spoke on the proposed Accreditation Matrix
- Dr. Rick Clemons, superintendent, Gloucester County Public Schools, representing the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS), spoke on proposed changes to the Standards of Quality

- Rachael Deane, staff attorney with Just Children, spoke on the proposed revisions to the Standards of Quality
- Megan Watkins, attorney with Just Children, spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Beth Hardy, school board member, Goochland County Public Schools, representing the Virginia School Boards Association (VSBA), spoke on the proposed *Model Policy Regarding Political Candidates and Public Officials* and the *Model Policy Regarding Controversial Issues*
- Tom Smith, representing the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS), spoke on the proposed *Model Policy Regarding Political Candidates and Public Officials* and the *Model Policy Regarding Controversial Issues*
- Sarah Gross, representing the Virginia Education Coalition, spoke on the proposed changes to the Standards of Quality
- Jamie Liban, executive director of the ARC of Virginia, spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Katherine Olson, representing Voices of Virginia, People First, and other self-advocacy groups for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Jim Livingston, president, Virginia Education Association, spoke on the proposed revisions to the Standards of Quality
- Dr. Gabriel Reich, history and social science teacher educator at Virginia Commonwealth University, spoke on the proposed *Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines*
- Robin Gahan, with the American Heart Association, spoke on the *Regulations Governing Nutritional Guidelines for Competitive Foods Available for Sale in the Public Schools*
- Lauren Schmidt with the School Nutrition Association of Virginia, spoke on the *Regulations Governing Nutritional Guidelines for Competitive Foods Available for Sale in the Public Schools*
- Gloria Rockhold, vice-chair, Virginia Latino Advisory Board, spoke on the proposed *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia*
- Kelly Harris-Braxton, executive director, Virginia First Cities, spoke on the proposed changes to the Standards of Quality
- Kandise Lucas spoke on the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*
- Tichi Pinkney Eppes, member, Richmond City School Board, spoke on the division-level academic review for Richmond City Public Schools

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.

A. Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved the financial report

on the Literary Fund as of June 30, 2016.

B. Final Review of Proposed Board of Education Meeting Dates for 2017

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved its meeting dates for 2017. They are as follows:

Each business meeting will begin at 9:00 am unless otherwise announced by the Board President.

Thursday, January 26
*Thursday, February 23
Thursday, March 23
Thursday, April 27
Thursday, May 25
Thursday, June 22
**Thursday, July 27
Thursday, September 28
Thursday, October 26
Thursday, November 16

Standing committee meeting dates for 2017 are noted below. Committee meetings will begin at 10:00 am unless otherwise announced by the Board President.

Wednesday, January 25
Wednesday, February 22
Wednesday, March 22
Wednesday, April 26
Wednesday, May 24
Wednesday, June 21
Wednesday, July 26
Wednesday, September 27
Wednesday, October 25
Wednesday, November 15

The term of office for the President and Vice-President of the Board is July 2015 - July 2017.

*The Vice-President's appointment expires January 29, 2017; therefore, an election to fill the Vice-President vacancy may take place at the February 23, 2017, meeting.

**An election for the President and Vice-President of the Board will take place at the July 27, 2017, meeting.

C. Final Review of Revisions to Family Life Education Board of Education Guidelines and Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools

With the Board's approval of the consent agenda, the Board approved revisions to the *Family Life Education Board of Education Guidelines and Standards of Learning for Virginia Public Schools*. The following is a summary of the revisions:

- Students will understand appropriate use of cell phones and other social media.
- Students will recognize and learn how to react to being influenced or coerced into selling their bodies for financial gain.
- A new standard was added pertaining to recognizing human trafficking as a crime, recognizing that victims may be male or female, and how laws provide protection.
- New language related to the permanency of misuse of social media and text messaging, along with criminal penalties for engaging in sexually explicit communication, has been added.
- A new standard was added for exploring safety issues associated with the Internet.
- New language for recognizing signs of human sex trafficking and how to seek adult assistance is included in the revisions.
- Students will identify messages about sexuality found in advertising, media, music and videos, television, films, the Internet, printed material, and graffiti.

ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

D. Final Review of Requests for Rating of Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School from Thirty-Six Schools Divisions

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. Ms. Rabil's presentation included the following:

- 8 VAC 20-131-300.C (*Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Virginia Public Schools*) states that a school shall be rated *Accreditation Denied* based on its academic performance and its failure to achieve the minimum threshold for the graduation and completion index required to be rated *Fully Accredited* or *Provisionally Accredited-Graduation Rate*, for the preceding three consecutive years or for three consecutive years anytime thereafter.
- As outlined in 8 VAC 20-131-315, as an alternative to the memorandum of understanding required for schools rated *Accreditation Denied*, a local school board may choose to reconstitute the school and apply to the Board of Education for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School*. The application shall include specific responses that address all areas of deficiency that resulted in the *Accreditation Denied* status.
- If a local school board chooses to reconstitute a school, it may annually apply for an accreditation rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* as provided for in 8 VAC 20-131-300.C.5. The *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* rating may be granted for a period not to exceed three years if the school is making progress toward a rating of *Fully Accredited* in accordance with the terms of the Board of Education's approval of the reconstitution application. The school will revert to a status of *Accreditation Denied* if it fails to meet the requirements to be rated *Fully Accredited* by the end of the three-year term or if it fails to have its annual application for such rating renewed.
- Following the implementation of revised assessments in mathematics in 2011-2012 and revised reading, writing, and science assessments in 2012-2013, ninety-nine (99) schools have not been *Fully Accredited* for three consecutive years and are not *Fully Accredited* in 2016-2017.
- Each school must meet the definition of reconstitution. As defined by the Fast Track *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Virginia Public Schools (SOA)*, reconstitution is defined as a process that may be used to initiate a range of accountability actions to improve pupil performance, curriculum, and instruction to address deficiencies that caused a school to be rated *Accreditation Denied* that may include, but not be limited to, restructuring a school's governance, instructional program, staff or student population.

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Reconstitution Type
Amelia County Public Schools	Amelia County Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Instructional Program and Staff
Amherst County Public Schools	Amelon Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Bedford County Public Schools	Moneta Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Caroline County Public Schools	Caroline Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Charlotte County Public Schools	Bacon District Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Camelot Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Chesapeake City Public Schools	George W. Carver Intermediate School (Paired school with Portlock Gr. 3-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Portlock Primary School (Paired school with Carver Gr.PK-2)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Rena B. Wright Primary School (Paired school with Truitt Gr.PK-2)	Instructional Program and Staff
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Truitt Intermediate School (Paired school with Wright Gr.3-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Cumberland County Public Schools	Cumberland Elementary School (Gr.PK-4)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Cumberland County Public Schools	Cumberland Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Danville City Public Schools	G. L. H. Johnson Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Danville City Public Schools	Schoolfield Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Essex County Public Schools	Essex Intermediate School (Gr.5-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Fairfax County Public Schools	Mount Vernon Woods Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Greensville County Public Schools	Belfield Elementary School (Gr.5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Greensville County Public Schools	Greensville Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Greensville County Public Schools	Edward W. Wyatt Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Halifax County Public Schools	Sinai Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Halifax County Public Schools	Halifax County Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance, Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	Aberdeen Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	Alfred S. Forrest Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	Captain John Smith Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	John Tyler Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	C. Alton Lindsay Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance and Instructional Program
Hampton City Public Schools	Jefferson Davis Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Instructional Program
Harrisonburg City Public Schools	Thomas Harrison Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Governance and Instructional Program

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Reconstitution Type
Henrico County Public Schools	Anthony Mehfoud Elementary School (Paired school with Varina Gr.PK-2)	Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Cashell Donahoe Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Fair Oaks Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Harold Macon Ratcliffe Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Sandston Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Varina Elementary School (Paired school with Mehfoud Gr.3-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Henrico County Public Schools	Brookland Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance, Instructional Program, Staff and Student Population
Hopewell City Public Schools	Patrick Copeland Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Hopewell City Public Schools	Carter G. Woodson Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Instructional Program and Staff
Lancaster County Public Schools	Lancaster Middle School (Gr.4-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Lancaster County Public Schools	Lancaster High School (Gr.9-12)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Dearington Elementary School for Innovation (Gr.PK-5)	Governance and Instructional Program
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Linkhorne Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance and Instructional Program
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Perrymont Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, and Instructional Program
Lynchburg City Public Schools	E. C. Glass High School (Gr.9-12)	Governance and Instructional Program
Madison County Public Schools	Madison Primary School (Paired school with Waverly Yowell Gr. PK-2)	Governance and Instructional Program
Madison County Public Schools	Waverly Yowell Elementary School (Paired school with Madison Gr. 3-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Manassas City Public Schools	Grace E. Metz Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Instructional Program
Martinsville City Public Schools	Albert Harris Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Martinsville City Public Schools	Martinsville High School (Gr.9-12)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Mecklenburg County Public Schools	South Hill Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Mecklenburg County Public Schools	Park View Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance and Instructional Program
Newport News City Public Schools	Joseph H. Saunders Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program, Staff and Student Population
Newport News City Public Schools	L. F. Palmer Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Newport News City Public Schools	T. Ryland Sanford Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Newport News City Public Schools	Heritage High School (Gr.9-12)	Instructional Program

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Reconstitution Type
Norfolk City Public Schools	Chesterfield Academy Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Norfolk City Public Schools	Coleman Place Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Norfolk City Public Schools	Norview Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Norfolk City Public Schools	Sherwood Forrest Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Norfolk City Public Schools	St. Helena Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Norfolk City Public Schools	Tanners Creek Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Norfolk City Public Schools	James Blair Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Instructional Program
Norfolk City Public Schools	Lake Taylor High School (Gr.9-12)	Instructional Program
Northampton County Public Schools	Occohannock Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Instructional Program
Nottoway County Public Schools	Blackstone Primary School (Gr.PK-4)	Instructional Program and Staff
Nottoway County Public Schools	Nottoway Intermediate School (Gr.5-6)	Instructional Program
Nottoway County Public Schools	Nottoway Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Instructional Program and Staff
Petersburg City Public Schools	J. E. B. Stuart Elementary School (Gr.K-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Petersburg City Public Schools	Robert E. Lee Elementary School (Gr.K-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Brighton Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Douglas Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Parkview Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Westhaven Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Portsmouth City Public Schools	William E. Waters Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Prince Edward County Public Schools	Prince Edward Elementary School (Gr.PK-4)	Instructional Program and Staff
Pulaski County Public Schools	Pulaski Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Instructional Program
Richmond City Public Schools	Blackwell Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program, Staff and Student Population
Richmond City Public Schools	Chimborazo Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	George Mason Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program, Staff and Student Population
Richmond City Public Schools	G. H. Reid Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	Ginter Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program
Richmond City Public Schools	J. L .Francis Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program, Staff and Student Population
Richmond City Public Schools	Miles Jones Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Reconstitution Type
Richmond City Public Schools	Oak Grove/Bellemeade Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	Overby-Sheppard Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	Westover Hills Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	Woodville Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Richmond City Public Schools	Thomas Jefferson High School (Gr.9-12)	Governance and Instructional Program
Roanoke City Public Schools	Garden City Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance and Instructional Program
Roanoke City Public Schools	Hurt Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Roanoke City Public Schools	Westside Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Rockbridge County Public Schools	Natural Bridge Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance and Instructional Program
Suffolk City Public Schools	Booker T. Washington Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Suffolk City Public Schools	Elephants Fork Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Suffolk City Public Schools	Mack Benn Jr. Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Suffolk City Public Schools	Kings Fork Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Governance, Instructional Program and Staff
Waynesboro City Public Schools	Wenonah Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Waynesboro City Public Schools	William Perry Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Instructional Program and Staff
Waynesboro City Public Schools	Kate Collins Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Instructional Program and Staff
Westmoreland County Public Schools	Cople Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Governance and Instructional Program

- Recommendations for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* are the result of examining a preponderance of evidence, with Standards of Learning data being the strongest or leading evidence. In addition to application criteria (described in the paragraph below), the following broad areas are considered in the review process for the 2016-2017 requests for reconstitution.
 - Improvement outcome data/positive trends in data
 - New leadership in the building with a track record of success in improvement
 - Positive observations of capacity and commitment of the division to improvement
 - Evidence of experiencing an extreme set of circumstances with an outcome based plan to prevent/solve the problem for the coming year(s)
- Applications for reconstitution are reviewed focusing on student performance data, areas of reconstitution, and the rationale for the trajectory of progress expected. The following criteria are used for the application review.
 - Demonstration of improvement in Standards of Learning achievement data in both warned and non-warned academic subjects (Did the data show improvement, decline, or have no change?)
 - Evidence of how the proposed reconstitution practices differ from the existing practices
 - Relevance of the anticipated impact of the proposed actions to the reconstitution plan
 - Expectations for measurable impact on student achievement
 - Clearly defined practices that ultimately improve student achievement

- Presence of a reasonable and rigorous trajectory of expected measureable progress
- Description of family engagement strategies for the school including the anticipated impact on student achievement

Technical Assistance

- All schools granted ratings of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will participate in technical assistance sessions provided by the Office of School (OSI). OSI technical assistance sessions for the 2016-2017 school year will focus on the comprehensive needs assessment component of continuous school improvement planning. Additionally schools rated *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will have triannual meetings with OSI, the support of an OSI contractor, and the opportunity to select from the newly developed OSI/VDOE Technical Assistance Menu. Additional differentiated support will be provided as needs are identified through the development of the Reconstitution Agreement.

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Atkinson summarized the discussion from the previous day's meeting of the Committee for School and Division Accountability. The meeting helped Board members understand better the process used by VDOE staff to make the recommendations for each school and have confidence that careful, deliberative, multi-faceted, and equitable recommendations have been made.
- Dr. Cannaday invited Board members to address any additional questions about Roanoke City Public Schools to Dr. Rita Bishop, superintendent, Roanoke City Public Schools, who had addressed the Board about the city's schools during public comment.
- Mrs. Wodiska noted that additional assistance would be provided to the two schools as a result of being denied *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status, and asked why the school division would not want that assistance. Dr. Bishop indicated that Roanoke City Public Schools had already hired two staff members to work with Hurt Park and Westside Elementary Schools full time every day, providing more assistance than that offered by the state.
- Mr. Bellamy asked what confidence the Board should have that these individuals would be effective. Dr. Bishop indicated the new personnel have an impressive track record, know the material, and are respected and trusted by staff.
- Mr. Bellamy asked what kind of support was provided by the state. Ms. Rabil indicated that *Accreditation Denied* status has several layers of support. The VDOE assigns an approved contractor trained by the Office of School Improvement to obtain the context of the school and offers technical assistance across the state. It conducts an onsite team visit and meets face to face with school and division leaders to share the results of the visit, which are included in the corrective action plan for the school. However, VDOE staff and contractors are not on the ground in the school every day;
- Mrs. Atkinson noted that the schools have been struggling for a number of years and wondered how problems could have continued in the school so long before they were noticed. Dr. Bishop said that Roanoke City had six schools in *Partially Accredited* status prior to last year. The individual assigned to work with the schools went on medical leave for a month almost immediately. The school division redistributed its instructional team's expertise among the schools, so they had the benefit of the full team, resulting in first benchmarks that looked good. When the individual returned from medical leave, the second benchmarks showed a decline. With the departure of

the individual working with the schools, the school division has spent a great deal of time rebuilding trust between the teachers and the division staff.

- Mrs. Wodiska thanked Dr. Bishop for owning the staffing situation and asked about the process in place now to encourage early identification of issues. Dr. Bishop stated that during the summer, the school division team began to replicate in the two schools the strategies implemented in the three successful schools.
- Mr. Romero asked about the role that parents and other stakeholders would be playing in the new plan. Dr. Bishop indicated the schools had family nights planned along with parent education events. They have been working on outreach to take involvement to parents rather than asking parents to come to the schools. School staff has a can-do attitude and are making phone calls to parents, sending packets home to parents, and asking about meeting times convenient to parents. Dr. Bishop noted the school board's significant investment in a reading program to help improve student performance.
- Mrs. Lodal thanked Dr. Bishop for coming to the Board with passion and advocacy. She noted the difficult position of the Board and that there are many schools with similar profiles in the state. She found it alarming that a single individual could impact so many people. Mrs. Lodal asked how long the *Denied Status* would exist if the schools' scores did not improve. Ms. Rabil indicated that *Denied Status* is year to year. Mrs. Lodal observed that it appeared the schools' faculties did not view the VDOE's assistance favorably. Dr. Bishop corroborated this observation. Mrs. Lodal noted that as a respected school leader, Dr. Bishop should be able to help her staff appreciate the need for the VBOE to be fair in implementing Board policies equally across the state if they proceeded with the *Accreditation Denied* status for the two schools. Dr. Bishop noted that she wanted to be sure the schools are receiving the help they need, and she wants her own staff to provide that assistance.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that Dr. Bishop has a strong history of academic leadership and respect as a school leader. Accreditation is based on evidence of sustained progress and student performance accomplished, not aspired. The schools in question have had four years to make progress and have not been able to do so.
- Mr. Gecker noted that unlike other school divisions, Roanoke has made a substantial financial commitment to school improvement. He noted that VDOE allowed Roanoke to proceed without assistance from the Department for the 2015-2016 school year. He suggested approving the two schools for *Partial Accreditation: Reconstituted School* status. He indicated that he believed that *not* denying these schools is what is best for the students at this time.
- Mrs. Wodiska indicated that she was also persuaded by Roanoke City's argument. She noted that staffing changes had been made. While she is concerned with fairness, she noted several examples of school divisions where scores are not nearly as high as those at the two Roanoke City schools, but they will be granted partial accreditation. She noted that Roanoke City has in place the data capacity, leadership, staffing, and investment of financial resources to support the schools. Granting partial accreditation to the two schools would allow the VDOE to devote its time and resources to schools that really need the assistance.
- Mrs. Atkinson noted that other school divisions with lower scores are showing progress whereas the two schools in Roanoke City have not shown progress. She asked Dr. Bishop what structures were in so these issues would not occur again. Dr. Bishop responded that she has a data team in place to check both schools weekly.

Teachers are provided with a regular data snapshot. Those having problems receive help in classroom management and instructional delivery. Academic coaches are conducting constant data checks, and Dr. Bishop herself receives daily data reports.

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the superintendent's recommendations for requests for rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for thirty-six school divisions, with the exception of *Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School in Roanoke City Public Schools*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and passed 8 to 1, with Mr. Dillard abstaining.

A request for a motion to approve the superintendent's recommendation to deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School in Roanoke City Public School failed.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from Roanoke City Public Schools for Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School (overriding the superintendent's recommendation). The motion was seconded by Mr. Gecker and passed 6 to 3, with Dr. Cannaday and Dr. Baysal voting against the motion and Mr. Dillard abstaining.

Dr. Cannaday explained that his vote against the motion was due to the fact that the VBOE's accreditation is based on actual student performance. He noted that he made an effort to apply the same set of rules for all when they are known well in advance, and that the accreditation rules are grounded in student performance over a four-year period, not just one year.

The following table and comments reflect the actions of the VBOE, with the two Roanoke City Schools (Hurt Park Elementary and Westside Elementary) noted in italics.

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Amelia County Public Schools	Amelia County Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Approve
Amherst County Public Schools	Amelon Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Bedford County Public Schools	Moneta Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Caroline County Public Schools	Caroline Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Charlotte County Public Schools	Bacon District Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Camelot Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Chesapeake City Public Schools	George W. Carver Intermediate School (Paired school with Portlock Gr. 3-5)	Approve
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Portlock Primary School (Paired school with Carver Gr.PK-2)	Approve

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Rena B. Wright Primary School (Paired school with Truitt Gr.PK-2)	Approve
Chesapeake City Public Schools	Truitt Intermediate School (Paired school with Wright Gr.3-5)	Approve
Cumberland County Public Schools	Cumberland Elementary School (Gr.PK-4)	Approve
Cumberland County Public Schools	Cumberland Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Approve
Danville City Public Schools	G. L. H. Johnson Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Danville City Public Schools	Schoolfield Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Essex County Public Schools	Essex Intermediate School (Gr.5-8)	Approve
Fairfax County Public Schools	Mount Vernon Woods Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Approve
Greensville County Public Schools	Belfield Elementary School (Gr.5)	Approve
Greensville County Public Schools	Greensville Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Greensville County Public Schools	Edward W. Wyatt Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Deny
Halifax County Public Schools	Sinai Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Halifax County Public Schools	Halifax County Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	Aberdeen Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	Alfred S. Forrest Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	Captain John Smith Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	John Tyler Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	C. Alton Lindsay Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Hampton City Public Schools	Jefferson Davis Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Harrisonburg City Public Schools	Thomas Harrison Middle School (Gr.5-8)	Approve
Henrico County Public Schools	Anthony Mehfood Elementary School (Paired school with Varina Gr.PK-2)	Approve
Henrico County Public Schools	Cashell Donahoe Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Henrico County Public Schools	Fair Oaks Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Henrico County Public Schools	Harold Macon Ratcliffe Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Henrico County Public Schools	Sandston Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Henrico County Public Schools	Varina Elementary School (Paired school with Mehfoud Gr.3-5)	Approve
Henrico County Public Schools	Brookland Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Hopewell City Public Schools	Patrick Copeland Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Hopewell City Public Schools	Carter G. Woodson Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Lancaster County Public Schools	Lancaster Middle School (Gr.4-8)	Deny
Lancaster County Public Schools	Lancaster High School (Gr.9-12)	Approve
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Dearington Elementary School for Innovation (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Linkhorne Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Perrymont Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Lynchburg City Public Schools	E. C. Glass High School (Gr.9-12)	Approve
Madison County Public Schools	Madison Primary School (Paired school with Waverly Yowell Gr.PK-2)	Deny
Madison County Public Schools	Waverly Yowell Elementary School (Paired school with Madison Gr.3-5)	Deny
Manassas City Public Schools	Grace E. Metz Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Approve
Martinsville City Public Schools	Albert Harris Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Martinsville City Public Schools	Martinsville High School (Gr.9-12)	Approve
Mecklenburg County Public Schools	South Hill Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Mecklenburg County Public Schools	Park View Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Newport News City Public Schools	Joseph H. Saunders Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Newport News City Public Schools	L. F. Palmer Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Newport News City Public Schools	T. Ryland Sanford Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Newport News City Public Schools	Heritage High School (Gr.9-12)	Approve
Norfolk City Public Schools	Chesterfield Academy Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Norfolk City Public Schools	Coleman Place Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Norfolk City Public Schools	Norview Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Norfolk City Public Schools	Sherwood Forrest Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Norfolk City Public Schools	St. Helena Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Norfolk City Public Schools	Tanners Creek Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Norfolk City Public Schools	James Blair Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Deny
Norfolk City Public Schools	Lake Taylor High School (Gr.9-12)	Deny
Northampton County Public Schools	Occohannock Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Approve
Nottoway County Public Schools	Blackstone Primary School (Gr.PK-4)	Approve
Nottoway County Public Schools	Nottoway Intermediate School (Gr.5-6)	Approve
Nottoway County Public Schools	Nottoway Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Approve
Petersburg City Public Schools	J. E. B. Stuart Elementary School (Gr.K-5)	Approve
Petersburg City Public Schools	Robert E. Lee Elementary School (Gr.K-5)	Approve
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Brighton Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Deny
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Douglas Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Deny
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Parkview Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Deny
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Westhaven Elementary School (Gr.PK-6)	Deny
Portsmouth City Public Schools	William E. Waters Middle School (Gr.7-8)	Deny
Prince Edward County Public Schools	Prince Edward Elementary School (Gr.PK-4)	Approve

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Pulaski County Public Schools	Pulaski Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	Blackwell Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	Chimborazo Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	George Mason Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	G. H. Reid Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	Ginter Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	J. L .Francis Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	Miles Jones Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	Oak Grove/Bellemeade Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Richmond City Public Schools	Overby-Sheppard Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	Westover Hills Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	Woodville Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Richmond City Public Schools	Thomas Jefferson High School (Gr.9-12)	Deny
Roanoke City Public Schools	Garden City Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
<i>Roanoke City Public Schools</i>	<i>Hurt Park Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)</i>	<i>Approve</i>
<i>Roanoke City Public Schools</i>	<i>Westside Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)</i>	<i>Approve</i>
Rockbridge County Public Schools	Natural Bridge Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Suffolk City Public Schools	Booker T. Washington Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Suffolk City Public Schools	Elephants Fork Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Suffolk City Public Schools	Mack Benn Jr. Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny
Suffolk City Public Schools	Kings Fork Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Approve
Waynesboro City Public Schools	Wenonah Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny

Name of Division	Name of School Requesting Rating of <i>Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School</i>	Action Taken
Waynesboro City Public Schools	William Perry Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Approve
Waynesboro City Public Schools	Kate Collins Middle School (Gr.6-8)	Deny
Westmoreland County Public Schools	Cople Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)	Deny

1. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Amelia County Middle School from the Amelia County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Amelia County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. Amelia County Middle School data qualify for this consideration.

2. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Amelon Elementary School from the Amherst County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Amherst County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Amelon Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

3. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Moneta Elementary School from the Bedford County School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Moneta Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

4. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Caroline Middle School from the Caroline County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Caroline County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This

agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Caroline County Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

5. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Bacon District Elementary School from the Charlotte County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Charlotte County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Bacon District Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

6. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Chesapeake City School Board for the following schools: George W. Carver Intermediate School, Portlock Primary School, Rena B. Wright Primary School, and Truitt Intermediate School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Chesapeake City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Portlock Primary School, Rena B. Wright Primary School, and Truitt Intermediate School data demonstrate progress in student achievement. For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. George W. Carver Intermediate School data qualify for this consideration.

7. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Camelot Elementary School from the Chesapeake City School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Camelot Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

8. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Cumberland County School Board for the following schools: Cumberland Elementary School and Cumberland Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Cumberland County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be

signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Cumberland Elementary School and Cumberland Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

9. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Danville City School Board for the following schools: G. L. H. Johnson Elementary School and Schoolfield Elementary School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: G. L. H. Johnson Elementary School and Schoolfield Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

10. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Essex Intermediate School from the Essex County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Essex County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Essex Intermediate School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

11. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Mount Vernon Woods Elementary School from the Fairfax County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Fairfax County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Fairfax County Public Schools presented additional data to support consideration of reconstituted status for Mount Vernon Woods Elementary School. A review of the request and accompanying data provide evidence for approving *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status for 2016-2017.

12. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Belfield Elementary School from the Greenville County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Greenville County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Belfield Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

13. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Greenville County School Board for the following schools: Greenville Elementary School and Edward W. Wyatt Middle School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.
Rationale: Greenville Elementary School and Edward W. Wyatt Middle School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.
14. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Halifax County School Board for the following schools: Sinai Elementary School and Halifax County Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Halifax County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: Sinai Elementary data demonstrate progress in student achievement. For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. Halifax County Middle School data qualify for this consideration.
15. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Hampton City School Board for the following schools: Aberdeen Elementary School, Alfred S. Forrest Elementary School, Captain John Smith Elementary School, John Tyler Elementary School, C. Alton Lindsay Middle School, and Jefferson Davis Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Hampton City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: Aberdeen Elementary School, Alfred S. Forrest Elementary School, Captain John Smith Elementary School, John Tyler Elementary School, and Jefferson Davis Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement. Hampton City Public Schools presented additional data to support consideration of reconstituted status for C. Alton Lindsay Middle School. A review of the request and accompanying data provide evidence for approving *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status for 2016-2017.
16. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Thomas Harrison Middle School from the Harrisonburg City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Harrisonburg City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this

school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Thomas Harrison Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

17. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Henrico County School Board for the following schools: Anthony Mehfood Elementary School, Cashell Donahoe Elementary School, Fair Oaks Elementary School, Sandston Elementary School, Varina Elementary School, and Brookland Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Henrico County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Anthony Mehfood Elementary School, Cashell Donahoe Elementary School, Sandston Elementary School, Varina Elementary School, and Brookland Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement. Henrico County Public Schools presented additional data to support consideration of reconstituted status for Fair Oaks Elementary School. A review of the request and accompanying data provide evidence for approving *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status for 2016-2017.

18. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Harold Macon Ratcliffe Elementary School from the Henrico County School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Harold Macon Ratcliffe Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

19. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Carter G. Woodson Middle School from the Hopewell City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Hopewell City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Carter G. Woodson Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

20. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Patrick Copeland Elementary School from the Hopewell City School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Patrick Copeland Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

21. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Lancaster High School from the Lancaster County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Lancaster County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Lancaster County Public Schools presented additional data to support consideration of reconstituted status for Lancaster High School. A review of the request and accompanying data provide evidence for approving *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status for 2016-2017.

22. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Lancaster Middle School from the Lancaster County School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Lancaster Middle School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

23. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Lynchburg City School Board for the following schools: Dearington Elementary School for Innovation, Linkhorne Elementary School, Perrymont Elementary School, and E.C. Glass High School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Lynchburg City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Dearington Elementary School for Innovation, Linkhorne Elementary School, Perrymont Elementary School, and E.C. Glass High School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

24. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Madison County School Board for the following schools: Madison Primary School and Waverly Yowell Elementary School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Madison Primary School and Waverly Yowell Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

25. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Grace E. Metz Middle School from the Manassas City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Manassas City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. Grace E. Metz Middle School data qualify for this consideration.
26. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Martinsville City School Board for the following schools: Albert Harris Elementary School and Martinsville High School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Martinsville City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: Albert Harris Elementary School and Martinsville High School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.
27. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Mecklenburg County School Board for the following schools: South Hill Elementary School and Park View Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Mecklenburg County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. South Hill Elementary School and Park View Middle School data qualify for this consideration.
28. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Newport News City School Board for the following schools: Joseph H. Saunders Elementary School, L.F. Palmer Elementary School, T. Ryland Sanford Elementary School, and Heritage High School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Newport News City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Joseph H. Saunders Elementary School, L.F. Palmer Elementary School, and Heritage High School data demonstrate progress in student achievement. For 2016-2017 reconstitution requests, schools that are within 5 percentage points of the English benchmark and meet the benchmark in all other content areas are being recommended for *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status. T. Ryland Sanford Elementary School data qualify for this consideration.

29. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Norfolk City School Board for the following schools: Chesterfield Academy Elementary School, Coleman Place Elementary School, and Sherwood Forest Elementary School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Norfolk City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Coleman Place Elementary School and Sherwood Forest Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement. Norfolk City Public Schools presented additional data to support consideration of reconstituted status for Chesterfield Academy Elementary School. A review of the request and accompanying data provide evidence for approving *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status for 2016-2017.

30. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Norfolk City School Board for the following schools: Norview Elementary School, St. Helena Elementary School, Tanners Creek Elementary School, James Blair Middle School, and Lake Taylor High School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Norview Elementary School, St. Helena Elementary School, Tanners Creek Elementary School, James Blair Middle School, and Lake Taylor High School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

31. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Occohannock Elementary School from the Northampton County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Northampton County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Occohannock Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

32. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Nottoway County School Board for the following schools: Blackstone Primary School, Nottoway

Intermediate School, and Nottoway Middle School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Nottoway County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Blackstone Primary School, Nottoway Intermediate School, and Nottoway Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

33. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Petersburg City School Board for the following schools: J.E.B. Stuart Elementary School and Robert E. Lee Elementary School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Petersburg City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: J.E.B. Stuart Elementary School and Robert E. Lee Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

34. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Portsmouth City School Board for the following schools: Brighton Elementary School, Douglas Park Elementary School, Parkview Elementary School, Westhaven Elementary School, and William E. Waters Middle School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Brighton Elementary School, Douglas Park Elementary School, Parkview Elementary School, Westhaven Elementary School, and William E. Waters Middle School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

35. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Prince Edward Elementary School from the Prince Edward County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Prince Edward County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Prince Edward Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

36. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Pulaski Middle School from the Pulaski County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Pulaski County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the

Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Pulaski Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

37. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Richmond City School Board for the following schools: G.H. Reid Elementary School, Ginter Park Elementary School, J. L. Francis Elementary School, Miles Jones Elementary School, and Oak Grove/Bellemeade Elementary School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Richmond City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in these schools. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the schools will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: G.H. Reid Elementary School, Ginter Park Elementary School, J. L. Francis Elementary School, Miles Jones Elementary School, and Oak Grove/Bellemeade Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

38. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Richmond City School Board for the following schools: Blackwell Elementary School, Chimborazo Elementary School, George Mason Elementary School, Overby-Sheppard Elementary School, Westover Hills Elementary School, Woodville Elementary School, and Thomas Jefferson High School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Blackwell Elementary School, Chimborazo Elementary School, George Mason Elementary School, Overby-Sheppard Elementary School, Westover Hills Elementary School, Woodville Elementary School, and Thomas Jefferson High School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

39. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Garden City Elementary School from the Roanoke City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Roanoke City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Garden City Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

40. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Roanoke City School Board for the following schools: Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School.

Rationale: The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended denial of a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School because their data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

The Board did not approve the Superintendent's recommendation. The Board of Education voted 6 – 3 to approve the rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Hurt Park Elementary School and Westside Elementary School. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Roanoke City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of Accreditation Denied. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

41. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Natural Bridge Elementary School from the Rockbridge County School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Rockbridge County Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Natural Bridge Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

42. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Kings Fork Middle School from the Suffolk City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Suffolk City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.

Rationale: Kings Fork Middle School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.

43. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Suffolk City School Board for the following schools: Booker T. Washington Elementary School, Elephant's Fork Elementary School, and Mack Benn Jr. Elementary School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.

Rationale: Booker T. Washington Elementary School, Elephant's Fork Elementary School, and Mack Benn Jr. Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

44. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education approve the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for William Perry Elementary School from the Waynesboro City School Board. The approval of this rating is contingent on the superintendent of Waynesboro City Public Schools entering into an agreement with the Superintendent of Public Instruction that details the essential actions that must occur in the 2016-2017 school year to improve the achievement of the students in this school. This agreement must be signed by both parties by January 31, 2017, or the school will revert to a designation of *Accreditation Denied*.
Rationale: William Perry Elementary School data demonstrate progress in student achievement.
45. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* from the Waynesboro City School Board for the following schools: Wenonah Elementary School and Kate Collins Middle School. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.
Rationale: Wenonah Elementary School and Kate Collins Middle School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.
46. The Superintendent of Public Instruction recommends that the Board of Education deny the request for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* for Cople Elementary School from the Westmoreland County School Board. School divisions that are denied their requests for a rating of *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Virginia Board of Education. The MOU must be developed and signed by December 16, 2016.
Rationale: Cople Elementary School data do not demonstrate progress in student achievement.

E. Final Review of Proposed Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder's presentation included the following:

- The 2014 Acts of Assembly eliminated the following Standards of Learning (SOL) assessments: Grade 3 Science, Grade 3 History, Grade 5 Writing, United States History to 1865 and United States History:1865 to the Present. In addition, the legislation requires school divisions to administer alternative assessments, consistent with Virginia Board of Education guidelines, to students in grades three through eight in each subject area in which SOL assessments were eliminated by the legislation. According to the legislation, the Virginia Board of Education was to develop guidelines that “(1) incorporate options for age-appropriate, authentic performance assessments and portfolios with rubrics and other methodologies designed to ensure that students are making adequate academic progress in the subject area and that the Standards of Learning content is being taught; (2) permit and encourage integrated assessments that include multiple subject areas; and (3) emphasize collaboration between teachers to administer and substantiate the assessments and the professional development of teachers to enable them to make the best use of alternative assessments.”

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia that § 22.1-253.13:3 of the Code of Virginia is amended as follows:

“Each school board shall annually certify that it has provided instruction and administered an alternative assessment, consistent with Board guidelines, to students in grades three through eight in each Standards of Learning subject area in which a Standards of Learning assessment was not administered during the school year. Such guidelines shall (1) incorporate options for age-appropriate, authentic performance assessments and portfolios with rubrics and other methodologies designed to ensure that students are making adequate academic progress in the subject area and that the Standards of Learning content is being taught; (2) permit and encourage integrated assessments that include multiple subject areas; and (3) emphasize collaboration between teachers to administer and substantiate the assessments and the professional development of teachers to enable them to make the best use of alternative assessments.”

- On September 18, 2014 the Board approved *Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines Developed in Response to 2014 Acts of Assembly*. These guidelines, which were for the 2014-2015 school year, acknowledged that the legislation’s timeline provided school divisions with an immediate deadline to implement the local assessments. As such, the guidelines for the 2014-2015 year provided school divisions with considerable flexibility.
- During the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 school years, grants were provided to the eight Superintendent’s Regions to support professional development in the development and implementation of performance assessments. A report on the use of these grants by school divisions was provided to the Board’s Committee on School and Division Accountability meeting at the March 16, 2016, meeting. At the same meeting the results of the desk audits of the local alternative assessment implemented in a sample of school divisions in 2014-2015 was provided to the Board.
- As part of the support to school divisions in implementing performance assessments, during the 2015-2016 school year, Dr. Chris Gareis from William and Mary worked with school division representatives to develop a framework to assist school divisions in evaluating their progress in moving toward the use of performance assessments. The framework, entitled *Framework for Local Alternative Assessment Implementation*, may be found on the Department’s website at http://doe.virginia.gov/testing/local_assessments/framework-for-laa-implementation.pdf.
- On September 26, 2016, the Virginia Department of Education co-sponsored a conference entitled *Assessing for Deeper Learning: A Transformative Pathway to Prepare Virginia Students for the Future* with the Jobs for the Future organization. Conference sessions provided school division personnel with more detailed information about the use of the framework to evaluate their progress in moving toward the implementation of performance assessments. In addition, the conference provided opportunities for participants to hear from national speakers about performance assessments and from local school divisions about their experiences in implementing performance assessments in their schools.
- New *Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines* have been developed based on the experiences of local school divisions in implementing these assessments in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. The new guidelines are intended to clarify the expectation that school divisions are to demonstrate progress in moving toward the use of performance assessments in their schools. School divisions are expected to use the *Framework for Local Alternative Assessment Implementation* to assess their progress in implementing performance assessments in their divisions and to report their status on the continuum to the Department of Education. Department staff will use the results to plan professional development. For the 2016-2017 school year, school divisions will be expected to use at least one performance assessment in classrooms where Grade 3 Science, Grade 3 History, Grade 5 Writing, United States History to 1865 and United States History from 1865 to the Present are taught. In 2017-2018 school divisions will be expected to share examples of performance assessments across divisions and by 2018-2019 school divisions should be prepared to partner with other divisions to score some of the assessments from each other’s schools.

Proposed Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines for 2016-2017 through 2018-2019

Legislative Mandate: House Bill 930 and Senate Bill 306

Legislation in the 2014 General Assembly amended [§ 22.1-253.13:3.C](#) of the *Code of Virginia* to eliminate

several Standards of Learning (SOL) tests:

- Grade 3 History,
- Grade 3 Science,
- Grade 5 Writing,
- United States History to 1865, and
- United States History: 1865 to the Present.

Specifically, the *Code* now states (emphasis added):

The Standards of Learning assessments administered to students in grades three through eight shall not exceed (a) reading and mathematics in grades three and four; (b) reading, mathematics, and science in grade five; (c) reading and mathematics in grades six and seven; (d) reading, writing, mathematics, and science in grade eight; and (e) Virginia Studies and Civics and Economics once each at the grade levels deemed appropriate by each local school board.

In addition to eliminating these SOL tests, the legislation also requires each local school board to annually certify that it has provided instruction and administered an alternative assessment, consistent with Virginia Board of Education guidelines, to students in grades three through eight in each SOL subject area in which the SOL assessment was eliminated. Specifically, the *Code* now states:

Each school board shall annually certify that it has provided instruction and administered an alternative assessment, consistent with Board guidelines, to students in grades three through eight in each Standards of Learning subject area in which a Standards of Learning assessment was not administered during the school year. Such guidelines shall (1) incorporate options for age-appropriate, authentic performance assessments and portfolios with rubrics and other methodologies designed to ensure that students are making adequate academic progress in the subject area and that the Standards of Learning content is being taught; (2) permit and encourage integrated assessments that include multiple subject areas; and (3) emphasize collaboration between teachers to administer and substantiate the assessments and the professional development of teachers to enable them to make the best use of alternative assessments.

Legislative Intent

In response to increasing concern regarding the amount of testing in local school divisions and the time spent in test preparation activities, legislation passed in the 2014 General Assembly eliminated some of the tests previously used for accountability. The intent of the legislation was to encourage the greater use of assessments, such as performance assessments, that may be used by teachers to improve their instruction. Such assessments provide information about what students have learned as well as the concepts and skills that they have not yet mastered.

Purpose of the Guidelines

The *Guidelines for Local Alternative Assessments for 2016-2017 through 2018-2019* are intended to clarify the expectation that school divisions are to demonstrate progress in moving toward the use of authentic performance assessments and provide a timeline for the implementation of performance assessments in Virginia schools. In addition, the guidelines are intended to encourage sharing high quality, authentic performance assessments, to help assess the need for ongoing professional development, and to provide the opportunity through a variety of approaches for students to be successful.

Definition of Authentic Performance Assessments

Performance assessments generally require students to perform a task or create a product that is typically scored using a rubric. Authentic performance assessments often include tasks that mirror those that might occur in a “real-life” situation.

Timeline for the Implementation of Performance Assessments

For the 2016-2017 school year, school divisions are expected to use at least one performance assessment in classrooms where Grade 3 Science, Grade 3 History, Grade 5 Writing, United States History to 1865 and United States History from 1865 to the Present are taught. In 2017-2018 school divisions will be expected to share examples of performance assessments across divisions, and, by 2018-2019, school divisions should be prepared

to partner with other divisions to score some of the assessments from each other's schools.

The expanded use of authentic, performance assessments constitutes a direction for the Commonwealth that is still relatively new. As such there is no expectation that the performance assessments will be perfectly executed immediately; rather, this should be viewed as an opportunity to engage in innovation that will provide new opportunities for students to demonstrate their knowledge of the curriculum.

Expectations for Inclusion of SOL in Alternative Assessments

School divisions should administer assessments that incorporate either each strand or reporting category¹ for that content area and grade level (e.g., the Economics strand² for Grade 3 History/Social Science or the Civics and Economics Reporting Category for US History: 1865 to the Present). However, the assessments will not be expected to cover all of the content standards contained in that strand.

Certification That Content Has Been Taught and Assessments Administered

Scores from the local assessments will not be reported to the Department of Education. Instead local school boards and division superintendents will certify through the annual Standards of Quality (SOQ) compliance assurance that local alternative assessments measuring the Standards of Learning (SOL) and adhering to the Board's guidelines have been administered. School divisions will be asked to prepare plans that describe how performance assessments that are designed to inform instruction will be implemented in 2016-2017 as well as how their use will be expanded in 2017-2018 and beyond. School divisions are expected to use the *Framework for Local Alternative Assessment Implementation* found at the end of these guidelines to assess their progress in implementing performance assessments in their divisions and to include their status on the continuum in the plans submitted to the Department of Education. The framework includes seven stages in the implementation of local performance assessments: readiness, design, develop, administer, use, account, and institutionalize/innovate. Included with the framework are two supplements that are intended to assist school divisions in determining in what stage they are in the continuum of implementing performance assessments. The first describes actions associated with each stage in the framework and the second identifies documents that could be used to verify a school division's placement in each stage. A third supplement provides examples of actions associated with enacting the vision of the Local Alternative Assessment Initiative.

Desk Reviews

During the 2016-2017 through the 2018-2019 school years Department staff will conduct annual site visits or "desk reviews" in which documents will be examined and school division staff interviewed either by webinar or by telephone. The purpose of these reviews will be to determine how local school divisions are verifying that the content is being taught, to determine the types of alternative assessments that are being administered, to identify exemplars of performance assessments that may be shared with other school divisions, and to assist teachers, schools and school divisions in strengthening their own alternative, performance assessments. The reviews will help Department staff to identify "best practices" for sharing with other Virginia school divisions. School divisions are to retain the documents listed below until the summer after the assessments are administered as some of the documents may be examined as a part of the desk reviews.

- 1) Documentation that demonstrates that the assessments administered address each strand or reporting category included in the SOL for that grade and subject,
- 2) Copies of the assessments, including performance tasks, and
- 3) Any ancillary materials such as rubrics or sample student responses used to train teachers.

Development or Selection of Assessments

The selection of the local assessments is left to the discretion of the school division. Assessments used should be designed to provide feedback to parents and teachers regarding the extent to which the student has demonstrated proficiency in the content included in the SOL covered and should demonstrate progress in implementing performance assessments.

Local school divisions may choose to administer the same assessments for particular grade levels and content areas to all students in the division or may provide schools with flexibility in choosing the assessments to be administered. ~~The use of division wide assessments ensures consistency across the division so that the local school board and superintendent can certify that the assessments required by this legislation have been administered. If school divisions choose to allow more flexibility at the school level in selecting the assessments, the school division should prepare a written plan detailing the evidence from each school that will~~

~~be reviewed by the local school board and superintendent to certify that the requirements of the legislation have been met.~~

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

School divisions should be aware of the following requirement found in [Section 300.160 c \(1\) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act](#):

A State (or, in the case of a district-wide assessment, an LEA) must develop and implement alternate assessments and guidelines for the participation of children with disabilities in alternate assessments for those children who cannot participate in regular assessments, even with accommodations, as indicated in their respective IEPs, as provided in paragraph (a) of this section.

If school divisions choose to meet the local alternative assessment requirements through the use of division wide assessments, an alternate assessment for students with disabilities who cannot participate in regular division assessment must be provided.

Use of Integrated Assessments

The legislation encourages *integrated assessments that include multiple subject areas*. For example, a local assessment might address content from both grade 3 history and grade 3 science. If such assessments are used, the results should include information about the extent to which the student has demonstrated proficiency in each reporting category or strand of the content of each specific set of SOL covered.

Professional Development

The capacity of teachers to design and implement assessments that are intended to inform instruction is likely to vary widely across the Commonwealth. School divisions should evaluate the capacity and experience of their teachers in implementing such assessments and to use this information to design professional development. Professional development should encourage the collaboration of teachers within grades and across grades in implementing the assessments and in using their results in determining instructional needs. School divisions are encouraged to leverage the resources and established training opportunities available from professional organizations.

Use of Local Assessments in State Accreditation or Federal Accountability

The results of the local authentic assessments will not be used to designate state accreditation or federal accountability status.

¹School divisions should be aware that the Scientific Investigation, Reasoning, and Logic strand of the grade 3 Science SOL is not to be assessed separately from the content strands but rather included as a part of local alternative assessments for each content strand. This strand represents a set of systematic inquiry skills that defines what a student will be able to do when planning and conducting investigations within the physical, biological, and Earth sciences.

²The strands for history SOL are: 1) History, 2) Geography, 3) Economics, and 4) Civics

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Atkinson acknowledged the work of stakeholders and the VDOE staff to create the guidelines. She also noted that the current guidelines are targeted to elementary and middle school assessments, and additional guidance will be needed for high school assessments once changes to the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* become effective.
- Mr. Romero asked about grading and scoring of local alternative assessments across divisions, especially related to professional development required to establish interrater reliability.
- Dr. Staples noted that the recommendation for grading local alternative assessments across school divisions will increase the discussion among teachers about the expectations for student achievement.

- Mr. Dillard indicated he had many questions about the guidelines and requested further assistance from Mrs. Loving-Ryder. Mrs. Loving-Ryder responded that she would be happy to provide assistance.

Mrs. Lodal made a motion to approve the proposed *Local Alternative Assessment Guidelines* to replace those adopted by the Board in September 2014. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Wodiska and carried unanimously.

F. Final Review of Recommendations to Revise the Standards of Quality (SOQ)

Dr. Cynthia Cave, assistant superintendent, Division for Policy and Communications, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Article VIII, §2 of the *Constitution of Virginia* requires the Board of Education to determine and prescribe Standards of Quality for the public schools in Virginia. The *Constitution* states:

“Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly. The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost of such program between the Commonwealth and the local units of government comprising such school divisions. Each unit of local government shall provide its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available funds.”

- The *Code of Virginia* requires the Board of Education to review the Standards of Quality every two years. Section 22.1-18.01 of the *Code* says, in part:

“To ensure the integrity of the standards of quality, the Board of Education shall, in even numbered years, exercise its constitutional authority to determine and prescribe the standards, subject to revision only by the General Assembly, by reviewing the standards and either (i) proposing amendments to the standards or (ii) making a determination that no changes are necessary....”

- The *Code* also requires that the Board’s annual report to the Governor and General Assembly include any recommendations for revisions to the Standards of Quality. Section 22.1-18 of the *Code* says, in part:

“...the Board of Education shall submit to the Governor and the General Assembly a report on the condition and needs of public education in the Commonwealth and shall identify any school divisions and the specific schools therein that have failed to establish and maintain schools meeting the existing prescribed standards of quality. Such standards of quality shall be subject to revision only by the General Assembly, pursuant to Article VIII, Section 2 of the Constitution of Virginia. Such report shall include...[a] complete listing of the current standards of quality for the Commonwealth's public schools, together with a justification for each particular standard, how long each such standard has been in its current form, and whether the Board recommends any change or addition to the standards of quality...”

- On August 7, 1971, the Board of Education adopted the first Standards of Quality (SOQ). They were revised by the General Assembly in 1972 and adopted as uncodified Acts of Assembly. In 1974, they were revised into eight standards. In 1984, they were codified by the General Assembly, and in 1988 they were arranged into their current format.
- The Board of Education revised its bylaws in October 2001 to require the Board to “determine the need for a review of the SOQ from time to time but no less than once every two years. The Standing

Committee on the Standards of Quality was created by resolution of the Board of Education in November 2001 and held its first meeting in January 2002. It completed its work on its first set of recommendations in June 2003 for consideration by the 2004 General Assembly.

- The Board's Standing Committee on the Standards of Quality commenced the current review of the SOQ with a meeting on October 2015, and subsequently met each month from January through July 2016. The public also could provide comment at each of these meetings.
- During the months of July and August 2016, the Board held four public hearings to solicit comments from the public on revisions to the Standards of Quality. These public hearings also were intended to gather comments on the conditions and needs of public education, the Profile of a Virginia Graduate and high school redesign, and the development of the state's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. These hearings were held in Abingdon, Lynchburg, Manassas, and Williamsburg. Throughout the Board's review of the SOQ, several organizations commented through letters, email, and public testimony, including: the Commonwealth Institute for Fiscal Analytics, JustChildren, the Virginia Association of Counties, Virginia Association of School Librarians, the Virginia Association of School Nurses, the Virginia Association of School Superintendents (VASS), the Virginia Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Virginia Education Association, Virginia First Cities, the Virginia Municipal League, the Virginia PTA, the Virginia Retired Teachers Association, the Virginia School Counselor Association, and Voices for Virginia's Children.
- The remarks conveyed to the Board related to the SOQ generally referenced increasingly complex issues that are driven by the diversity of the student population and increased expectations to provide a quality education for every student. Additional staffing levels are needed to be responsive to these issues. Comments also reflected needs related to the implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, positions needed to effectively support at-risk student populations, and a need for the commonwealth to restore support for the public education system to pre-recession levels.
- While developing these recommendations, the Board sought to align resources to support the K-12 system's changing student population and their needs, and to support the implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* and high school redesign. The Board also was mindful of its other priorities of supporting teachers and school leaders, and of establishing a comprehensive school accountability system that measures and reports several indicators of school quality.
- Based on public comment received to date, and consistent with the Board's goals, the following proposed revisions the Standards of Quality are recommended:

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

During the last ten years, the total student population has increased by only six percent, while the number of economically disadvantaged students has increased by 39 percent (currently representing 39 percent of the student population), and the number of English Learners has increased by 63 percent (currently representing ten percent of the student population). In addition, during that same period, the number of students identified with autism has increased by 222 percent and the number of students identified in the other health impairments disability category has increased by 26 percent. These demographic trends call attention to the increasing pressures that school divisions are facing to provide the supports needed to ensure success for all students. Many school divisions have established positions above the SOQ minimum levels to address the diverse needs of the student population.

The Board of Education also has begun working to redesign the school experience through the development of a *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, including redesigned high school graduation expectations. This initiative, developed in partnership with the business community, higher education, K-12 educators, parents and other stakeholders, recognizes that the skill sets acquired through the K-12 system must be sufficient for students to succeed in jobs resulting from the changing economy and evolving technologies. The *Profile* emphasizes the knowledge, skills, competencies, and experiences necessary for graduates to be successful, and includes multiple pathways to graduation, emphasizes career exploration and planning, and requires students to demonstrate mastery of five core competencies: communication, collaboration, critical and

creative thinking, and citizenship. Students will need support in the development and ongoing monitoring of academic and career plans. The revised graduation expectations will also require professional development and technical assistance to assist school staff with redesigning instructional strategies, curriculum, and assessments.

Although the expectations and challenges faced by the public education system have increased during recent decades, the commonwealth has not adjusted the minimum staff to student ratios accordingly. During that period of time, most of the staffing requirements in the Standards of Quality and corresponding state support have not changed, although the roles of these positions have transformed as the emphasis on accountability in public education has intensified, and the numbers of students who require more intensive services has increased.

The following recommendations are intended to ensure that a standard level of quality support and instruction is available to all students, to provide adequate support for the implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, and to build capacity in local school divisions by recognizing the expanded role of certain staff positions in direct support of students to remove barriers to learning. Other recommendations are included that are intended to improve the data availability and timing for future SOQ reviews.

Pursuant to Article VIII, § 2 of the *Constitution of Virginia* and Section 22.1-18.01 of the *Code of Virginia*, the Board of Education reviewed the current Standards of Quality and presents to the Governor and General Assembly the following proposed revisions:

Proposed changes to Standard 1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives.

- **Establishing Awareness of Available Pathways**
 - **Background.** Standard One currently requires school divisions to implement plans to notify students and parents of opportunities for dual enrollment, Advanced Placement class, International Baccalaureate, and Academic Year Governor's School Programs. There is no corresponding requirement for students and parents to be notified of other opportunities that are geared toward career readiness, such as internships or externships, or other work-based learning experiences.
 - **Recommendation.** Given the Board's current work that will revise high school graduation requirements to include multiple pathways toward college and career readiness, including opportunities for internships, externships and credentialing, it would be appropriate to ensure that notice of opportunities for career and technical education is afforded to all students, and provided in the *Code of Virginia*.
 - **Proposed Language.**

§ 22.1-253.13:1. Standard 1. Instructional programs supporting the Standards of Learning and other educational objectives.

D. Local school boards shall also implement the following:

11. A plan to notify students and their parents of the availability of dual enrollment and advanced placement classes, the International Baccalaureate Program, and Academic Year Governor's School Programs, and career and technical education programs, the qualifications for enrolling in such classes and programs, and the availability of financial assistance to low-income and needy students to take the advanced placement and International Baccalaureate examinations. This plan shall include notification to students and parents of the agreement with a community college in the Commonwealth to enable students to complete an associate's degree or a one-year Uniform Certificate of General Studies concurrent with a high school diploma.

Proposed changes to Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

- **Assistant Principals**

- **Background.** Standard Two currently requires school divisions to employ assistant principals as follows:
 - Elementary Schools
 - Up to 599 students: none
 - 600 to 899 students: one half-time assistant principal
 - 900 or more students: one full-time assistant principal
 - Middle and High Schools
 - Up to 599 students: none
 - One full-time assistant principal for each 600 students
 - School divisions must meet these requirements on a division-wide basis and may assign assistant principals to schools according to area of greatest need, regardless of whether such school is an elementary, middle, or high school.

Assistant principals serve as part of a school's management team, and the workload faced by assistant principals today is related to the growing responsibilities of principals. With the emphasis on accountability, school quality, and academic success for all students, the role of the principal has expanded to serving as the school's instructional leader as well as its administrator.

Today, principals must devote significant time to school improvement, including activities such as data analysis, curriculum development, and teacher evaluation. Principals work with school staff to develop strategies for improvement which require identification of students in need of intervention and remediation, and identification of professional development needs to assist teachers in improving instructional strategies.

As the role of the principal has grown, school divisions have recognized these expanded duties and accordingly provided additional support with assistant principal positions in addition to those that are required by the SOQ. If school divisions were not providing these additional positions, school principals would be required to delegate certain duties to senior teaching staff, diverting resources available for instruction. Today, assistant principals work closely with the principal to implement school improvement efforts and strategies.

To illustrate how demand for assistant principals has increased, in 1983, school divisions collectively provided one assistant principal per 738 students, whereas in 2015, local school divisions provided one assistant principal per 501 students. During 2015, however, the SOQ provided funding for only about one-third of those positions, at a ratio of about one assistant principal per 1,385 students.

Support for increasing the SOQ staffing ratio for assistant principals was expressed by individuals at the public hearings, and through a letter submitted by VASS.

Since 2003, the Board of Education has recommended the General Assembly increase the assistant principal staffing standard to require one assistant principal for every 400 students.

- **Recommendation.** Because administering a school has become increasingly more complex, school divisions have recognized a need to provide additional assistant principals at almost three times the rate required by the Standards of Quality. In order to ensure that a high quality system of educational leadership is provided in every school, the staffing ratio should be adjusted to provide one full-time assistant principal for each 400 students.

- Proposed Language.

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

H. Each local school board shall employ, at a minimum, the following full-time equivalent positions for any school that reports fall membership, according to the type of school and student enrollment:

2. Assistant principals in elementary schools, ~~one half-time at 600 students~~, one full-time at ~~900~~ 400 students; assistant principals in middle schools, one full-time for each ~~600~~ 400 students; assistant principals in high schools, one full-time for each ~~600~~ 400 students; and school divisions that employ a sufficient number of assistant principals to meet this staffing requirement may assign assistant principals to schools within the division according to the area of greatest need, regardless of whether such schools are elementary, middle, or secondary;

- **Elementary School Principals**

- Background. Standard Two currently requires school divisions to employ a full-time principal in all schools, except for elementary schools with 299 or fewer students, which are only required to employ a half-time principal.

The principal serves as the instructional leader and building manager, in addition to implementing school improvement practices. For small schools, accomplishing this between two geographically distant schools is logistically difficult, as has been recognized by the staffing practices utilized in most of Virginia's small elementary schools.

In every school, a principal also should be present to serve in a leadership role to ensure that a safe learning environment is maintained. For example, in a crisis situation the principal oversees and responds without being responsible for direct supervision of children. If a principal is not present when a situation arises, a lead teacher would have to assume the leadership role while also being responsible for the direct supervision of children.

Based on Fall 2015 membership counts, Virginia has approximately 1,150 elementary schools, of which 153 have fewer than 299 students. These small elementary schools tend to be concentrated in Virginia's least densely populated counties, where consolidating schools is not practical due to lengthy travel times between population centers. In practice, there appear to be only four instances where a school division has required a principal to split his or her time between two small elementary schools, despite there being 153 such small elementary schools.

VASS has expressed support for one 12-month principal to be provided in every elementary school.

Since 2003, the Board of Education has recommended the General Assembly provide one principal in each elementary school.

- Recommendation. Because the role of the principal has grown increasingly complex, and the principal is essential to ensure that schools are safe and secure, a full-time principal should be provided for every elementary school, regardless of size. Therefore, the staffing standard should be adjusted accordingly.
- Proposed Language.

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

H. Each local school board shall employ, at a minimum, the following full-time equivalent positions for any school that reports fall membership, according to the type of school and student enrollment:

1. Principals in elementary schools, ~~one half-time to 299 students; one full-time, to be employed on a 12-month basis at 300 students;~~ principals in middle schools, one full-time, to be employed on a 12-month basis; principals in high schools, one full-time, to be employed on a 12-month basis;

- **School Counselors**

- **Background.** Standard Two of the Standards of Quality (SOQ) currently requires school divisions to employ counselors as follows:
 - Elementary Schools
 - One hour per day per 100 students
 - One full-time at 500 students
 - One hour per day additional time per 100 students or major fraction thereof
 - Middle Schools
 - One period per 80 students
 - One full-time at 400 students
 - One additional period per 80 students or major fraction thereof
 - High Schools
 - One period per 70 students
 - One full-time at 350 students
 - One additional period per 70 students or major fraction thereof
 - School divisions must meet these requirements on a division-wide basis and may assign counselors to schools according to area of greatest need, regardless of whether such school is an elementary, middle, or high school.

The role of the school counselor has been impacted by expanding responsibilities, including provision of comprehensive services to address students' academic, social and emotional development needs throughout their K-12 experience. These responsibilities are in addition to traditional counselor roles such as providing one-on-one services related to academic and career planning. For difficult to serve populations, the school counselor is increasingly involved in the coordination of academic intervention services and dropout prevention.

The *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* will intensify the need for additional school counselors further, as academic and career planning will be enhanced at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Academic and career plans, which are already required to be developed during the middle school years, will become integrated into the redesigned high school, requiring more one-on-one planning time as counselors work with students to select and periodically review their pathways to graduation. Elementary and middle schools will also need additional counseling resources, as students will be expected to begin exploring career interests during the elementary years and a career investigations course is proposed in middle school, which is envisioned to closely involve counselors.

Through a roundtable discussion with Board of Education members and VDOE staff, school counselors indicated that duties assigned to these positions have begun to shift toward non-counseling roles such as attendance, testing, clerical, and social work. Counselors also have taken on additional duties as requirements for academic and career plans have been implemented in recent years, and expanded work is anticipated as a result of the implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*. At the public hearings, several individuals commented on the need to lower the counselor to student ratio provided in the SOQ.

Based on FY2015, there was approximately one counselor for every 329 students in Virginia, while the SOQ standards required only approximately one counselor for every 425 students. The American School Counselor Association's publication [*The Role of the School Counselor*](#) recommends a ratio of one counselor to every 250 students.

- Recommendation. Because additional demands have been placed on counselors, and need for counselor support is anticipated to increase due to future changes in Virginia schools, the student to staff ratio for counselors should be adjusted to one counselor to every 250 students.
- Proposed Language.

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

H. Each local school board shall employ, at a minimum, the following full-time equivalent positions for any school that reports fall membership, according to the type of school and student enrollment:

~~4. Guidance counselors in elementary schools, one hour per day per 100 students, one full time at 500 students, one hour per day additional time per 100 students or major fraction thereof; guidance counselors in middle schools, one period per 80 students, one full time at 400 students, one additional period per 80 students or major fraction thereof; guidance counselors in high schools, one period per 70 students, one full time at 350 students, one additional period per 70 students or major fraction thereof. Local school divisions that employ a sufficient number of guidance counselors to meet this staffing requirement may assign guidance counselors to schools within the division according to the area of greatest need, regardless of whether such schools are elementary, middle, or secondary.~~

K. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent school counselor position per 250 students in grades kindergarten through 12.

- **Staffing Standards for Psychologists, Social Workers, and School Nurses**

- Background. Although state assistance is provided, the SOQ does not establish minimum staffing levels for support services-designated positions, which includes positions ranging from those that provide direct student support to those that maintain school facilities. Local school boards have the discretion to fill these positions as they deem necessary. This is in contrast to the minimum instructional position staffing levels that are specified in the SOQ.

School psychologists, school social workers, and school nurses are critical to ensuring that all students, regardless of their situation, have access to a high quality education. Recent significant increases in economically disadvantaged students, English Learners, and students needing more intensive special education services underscore the need for school divisions to provide these supports that address students' mental, emotional and physical health needs. For many of these students, school may be the only place where these services can be accessed.

School social workers collaborate with students, their families, and school staff to address problems that may impact a student's ability to succeed. This collaboration includes linking these students with appropriate resources and assisting teachers and school administrators with appropriate practices to be used with these students' individual situations. Social workers also serve as the coordinator of services for homeless students and those in foster care. The National Association of Social Workers in 2012 published its [*NASW Standards for School Social Work Services*](#), which recommends a staff to student ratio of one to 50 to one to 250, depending on level of services needed.

School nurses help to ensure that schools are safe learning environments for all students. Their role has grown as more students are enrolled with complex medical conditions that require skilled medical care. In addition, schools in recent years have been mandated to administer certain medications for students with acute diabetic and allergic conditions. The National Association of School Nurses in 2015 published its [*School Nurse Workload: Staffing for Safe Care*](#), which does not recommend a specific staffing ratio, but rather an approach that considers student and community needs. This document also acknowledges that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' recommended ratio of one school nurse for every 750 students. This recommended ratio is lower than the estimated ratio of one school nurse per 600 students that is currently provided by local school divisions.

The primary responsibility for school psychologists in previous years was to assess students for eligibility for special education services. This role has increased as school psychologists now provide direct support and interventions for students facing academic, behavioral or social-emotional problems. School psychologists also now collaborate with teachers and principals at the school-wide, classroom and individual level to develop and implement practices to improve academic achievement and school climate. The National Association of School Psychologists in 2010 published its [*Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services*](#), which generally recommends a ratio of one psychologist per 1,000 students; with even lower ratios recommended when more intensive services are needed.

Currently, there is limited data on the number of social workers, school psychologists, and school nurses employed by each school division due to inconsistent reporting among school divisions. The estimated ratios of these positions, based upon FY2015 data is:

- School psychologists: One position per approximately 1500 to 1900 students
- School social workers: One position per approximately 1600 students
- School nurses: One position per approximately 600 students

Individuals at the public hearings commented on the need to increase the number of each of these staff positions available, especially for students who do not have access to the services outside of the school system. Over 50 emails were sent to the Board of Education in support of increasing the number of school social workers, and an online petition was submitted with about 1,400 signatures to recognize the importance of school nurses. The Commonwealth Institute for Fiscal Analytics indicated that funding to serve at-risk populations lags behind that of other states. Ensuring access to these positions is one method by which the commonwealth could increase its contribution to serving at-risk students.

- Recommendation. A minimum level of staffing should be provided for social worker, psychologist and school nurse positions to ensure that all students may access these services. This would involve moving these positions from the support service positions category to a prescribed ratio in the Standards of Quality.
- Proposed Language.

§ 22.1-253.13:2. Standard 2. Instructional, administrative, and support personnel.

K. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent school nurse position per 550 students in grades kindergarten through 12.

L. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent school psychologist position per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12.

M. Local school boards shall employ one full-time equivalent school social worker position per 1,000 students in grades kindergarten through 12.

O. Each local school board shall provide those support services that are necessary for the efficient and cost-effective operation and maintenance of its public schools.

For the purposes of this title, unless the context otherwise requires, "support services positions" shall include the following:

3. Student support positions, including (i) ~~social workers and~~ social work administrative positions; (ii) guidance administrative positions not included in subdivision H 4; (iii) homebound administrative positions supporting instruction; (iv) attendance support positions related to truancy and dropout prevention; and (v) health and behavioral positions, ~~including other than~~ school nurses, ~~and~~ school psychologists, and school social workers;

Proposed changes to the Appropriation Act related to the Standards of Quality.

- **Recession Era Waivers**

- Background. In 2010, the General Assembly added language to the Appropriation Act to override certain staffing standards in Standard Two that:
 - Permitted school divisions to increase teacher to pupil staffing ratios in kindergarten through grade 7, and in English classes for grades 6 through 12 by one additional student.
 - Waived teacher to pupil staffing ratios for:
 - Elementary resource teachers
 - Prevention, intervention, and remediation teachers
 - English as a second language teachers
 - Gifted and talented teachers
 - Career and technical funded programs (unless federal Occupational Safety & Health Administration safety requirements impose a maximum class size)
 - Instructional and support technology positions (new hires only)
 - Librarians (new hires only)
 - Guidance counselors (new hires only)

These waivers were implemented during the recession to provide school divisions with temporary staffing flexibility by increasing pupil staffing ratios and eliminating staffing requirements in certain disciplines. School divisions choosing to utilize these provisions in lieu of providing the SOQ-prescribed positions may do so with no loss of state funding.

There is limited data on how school divisions are utilizing these waivers. As part of the SOQ compliance data collection, school divisions are asked if they are using any of these provisions, but are not asked specifically how they are utilizing the waivers. In the 2015-2016 school year, 53 school divisions claimed that they were utilizing the waivers.

VASS submitted a letter maintaining that school divisions need additional staffing flexibility, rather than a single statewide standard, especially as the revised high school graduation requirements emerge. The organization also suggests developing alternative processes for school divisions to implement innovative staffing practices that may be out of alignment with the existing SOQ.

- Recommendation. Because the SOQ was established to ensure a minimum level of quality among school divisions in the commonwealth, these provisions should be eliminated to ensure that these positions are provided. The need for flexible staffing standards should be addressed comprehensively through ongoing dialogue with VASS, findings based on high school redesign efforts, and the recommendations of the General Assembly's Joint

Committee to Study the Future of Public Elementary and Secondary Education (H.J. 112, S.J. 85, 2016).

- Proposed Legislative Action. To implement this, Item 139 A.17 of the 2016-2018 Appropriation Act should be stricken.

- **Support Position Cap**

- Background. The SOQ requires school divisions to provide support services positions as deemed necessary by each school board for the efficient and cost-effective operation and maintenance of its public schools. This category of positions includes: superintendents, school board members, central office personnel, social workers, psychologists, nurses, attendance staff, clerical, maintenance, security, and school transportation staff, and others. Prior to 2009, SOQ funds were provided for these positions based upon the prevailing per-pupil rates that school divisions were filling these positions.

In 2009, the General Assembly amended the method of funding these positions by limiting the number of positions at 1 support position per 4.03 instructional positions, excluding the positions of division superintendent, school board, school nurse, and school transportation positions. This revised methodology, initially implemented as a cost-cutting measure during the economic downturn, and does not reflect the actual prevailing ratios of support staff that is provided by school divisions.

Throughout the public hearings, the need for additional fiscal resources was a predominant theme. Many individuals and organizations, including the Virginia Association of Counties and the Virginia Municipal League, have noted that education funding in Virginia after the recession has not returned to 2008 levels.

- Recommendation. Because support services positions are essential to the effective operation of schools, and provide vital support to instructional staff, the General Assembly should return to its prior practice of funding support services to school divisions based upon actual local school division practices.
- Proposed Legislative Action. To implement this, Item 139 C.5.k of the 2016-2018 Appropriation Act should be stricken.

Other recommended actions.

- **Adjust SOQ Review Cycle**

- Background. Section 22.1-18.01 of the *Code of Virginia* establishes that the Board's SOQ recommendations be made in even-numbered years. If these recommendations were made in odd-numbered years, they could be developed in concert with the Governor's biennial budget process, whereby the Governor's budget is introduced in December of odd-numbered years.
- Recommendation. Propose legislation to shift the review of the SOQ from even to odd-numbered years to be aligned more effectively with the legislative budget process.
- Proposed Language.

§ 22.1-18.01. Biennial review of the standards of quality required; budget estimates.

A. To ensure the integrity of the standards of quality, the Board of Education shall, in ~~even-numbered~~ odd-numbered years, exercise its constitutional authority to determine and prescribe the standards, subject to revision only by the General

Assembly, by reviewing the standards and either (i) proposing amendments to the standards or (ii) making a determination that no changes are necessary.

B. In any ~~odd-numbered~~ even-numbered year following the year in which the Board proposes changes to the standards of quality, the budget estimates that are required to be reported pursuant to § 2.2-1504 shall take into consideration the Board's proposed standards of quality.

- **Data availability for SOQ position assignments**

- Background. During the SOQ Committee's deliberations, staffing standards for special education, career and technical education staffing, and English as a Second Language staffing were discussed as areas for further focus. There are limitations on the data collected regarding the local assignment of these positions, therefore it would be inappropriate to make a staffing recommendation at this time. In lieu of making actual recommendations, a more in depth study should be conducted to determine data needs to examine how local school divisions are allocating staff.
- Recommendation. Propose an in-depth study be conducted to ensure that adequate data is available regarding the local deployment of SOQ positions.

- **Other key issues raised during public hearings**

Throughout the public hearing process, several individuals and organizations stressed the need for additional resources for professional development and librarians. With the implementation of the expectations of the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, specific needs for professional development and librarians can be identified and examined through future SOQ reviews.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

- Propose legislation to amend the *Code of Virginia* to ensure that students and parents are made aware of career and technical education opportunities.
- Require one full-time assistant principal for every 400 students in grades K-12.
- Require one full-time principal in every elementary school.
- Require one school counselor for every 250 students in grades K-12.
- Require one full-time school psychologist for every 1,000 students.
- Require one full-time social worker for every 1,000 students.
- Require one full-time school nurse for every 550 students.
- Eliminate the flexibility provisions established in the Appropriation Act that waives or override certain staff to student ratios that are established in the Standards of Quality.
- Eliminate the methodology established in the Appropriation Act that artificially caps the number of state-funded support positions at 1 support position for every 4.03 instructional positions.
- Propose legislation to shift the review of the SOQ from even to odd-numbered years to be aligned more effectively with the legislative budget process.
- Propose an in-depth study be conducted to ensure that adequate data is available regarding the local deployment of SOQ positions.

Impact on Fiscal and Human Resources

The additional state cost to implement the staffing recommendations is estimated to be:

Recommended Staffing Changes	FY 2018
Assistant Principal: One for every 400 students	\$71.4 million
Principal: One full-time in every elementary school	\$6.8 million
School Counselor: One for every 250 students	\$82.4 million

School Psychologist: One for every 1,000 students	\$42.7 million
School Social Worker: One for every 1,000 students	\$48.7 million
School Nurse: One for every 550 students	\$1.8 million
Eliminate the cap on funded support positions	\$339.6 million

Board discussion:

- Dr. Cannaday reviewed the discussion from the October 26, 2016, meeting of the Committee on the Standards of Quality and noted important areas for the VBOE to address related to proposed amendments to the Standards of Quality:
 - The Board must take action on the recommendations to revise the Standards of Quality based on prevailing practice.
 - If the Board's recommendations to revise the Standards of Quality are not fully funded, what should be the position of the Board?
 - The Board must develop a future strategy for developing Standards of Quality staffing recommendations based on needs vs. prevailing practice.
 - The Board must work collaboratively with the Joint Committee to Study the Future of Public Elementary and Secondary Education in the Commonwealth to make improvements to the Standards of Quality.
 - It is important for the Board to maintain transparency in all deliberations and actions.
- Dr. Cannaday noted an addition from the previous day's discussion to be added to Standard 5 of the proposal as presented to the Board:
 - Professional development to support implementation of local alternative assessments; and
 - Professional development related to implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* and school redesign, noting that professional development would be required for teachers and administrators in Kindergarten through Grade 12.
- Mrs. Wodiska indicated she would be happy to work with members of the Board to prioritize the list of requests in the event the requests were not fully funded. She noted that several precedents for funding formulas in federal and state law could inform discussions about prioritizing the requests.
- Mr. Dillard noted the positive feedback the Board had received from across the state for doing what is right for students. He felt the Board should insist that the General Assembly find the necessary funds to meet what is now at least prevailing practice. He felt that the urgency would be removed if the Board created a priority list. Rather, he felt that Board members would need to network with other groups to assert pressure on the General Assembly to fund the request rather than take steps to create a priority list.
- Mr. Bellamy concurred with Mr. Dillard.
- Mrs. Atkinson indicated her willingness to assist with a priority list. While she appreciated Mr. Dillard's position, she felt that the Board needed to be prepared to respond if asked to prioritize. She felt that no answer would be an abdication of the Board's responsibility, and that if the Board was not prepared with a response, the General Assembly might set its own priorities, which may not be congruent with those of the Board.
- Mrs. Wodiska noted that the proposed amendments to the Standards of Quality represent not what the Board wants but what is needed to create the capacity to

implement the goals set forth by the General Assembly for the Board and Virginia's school divisions.

- Mr. Gecker advocated approaching the next SOQ review cycle in a different manner, noting that it will be important to have substantive data to justify staffing in excess of current standards in the future.
- Mrs. Lodal indicated she was hesitant to move forward with prioritization, but she felt the Board needed to be collaborative. She noted she would be happy to work with a joint committee of Board members and other organizations.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that no action related to prioritization was needed at this time. He suggested that in November, the Board discuss ways to become better informed for future Standards of Quality work.
- Mr. Gecker suggested that it would be helpful to have some idea of the willingness of the Joint Committee to Study the Future of Public Elementary and Secondary Education in the Commonwealth to work with the Board on these issues.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that he and Dr. Staples had been asked to consult with the Joint Committee. He and Dr. Staples will share the intent of the Board based on discussions from the previous day's Standards of Quality Committee meeting and today's Board meeting.
- Mrs. Lodal suggested that VDOE staff could weigh in on the concept of tiering and other ways to differentiate assistance and needs for some areas over others.
- Dr. Cannaday summarized the Board's discussion:
 - There would be follow up with the co-chairs of the Joint Committee.
 - There is a willingness of Board members to be collaborative partners as the Standards of Quality recommendations move forward.
 - The intent of revising the Standards of Quality is to move all schools to a high standard based on expectations.
 - The Board and the public will be kept abreast of the status of the recommendations as they move forward.
 - The divergent points of view expressed by Board members contributed to a healthy discussion representing the various backgrounds and experiences individual members bring to the Board.

Mr. Gecker made a motion to approve the proposed revisions to the Standards of Quality. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Lodal and passed unanimously.

G. Second Review of Proposed Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia (Proposed Stage)

Mr. John Eisenberg, assistant superintendent; Ms. Pat Haymes, director, Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services; and Ms. Kathy Harris, complaints specialist, Office of Dispute Resolution and Administrative Services, Division of Special Education and Student Services, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The Virginia General Assembly enacted HB 1443 (2014), amending the *Code of Virginia* by adding section number 22.1-279.1:1, relating to the use of seclusion and restraint in public schools. The bill requires the Board of Education to adopt regulations on the use of seclusion and restraint in public elementary and secondary schools in the Commonwealth that (i) are consistent with its *Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Managing Student Behavior in Emergency Situations*

and the *Fifteen Principles* contained in the U.S. Department of Education's *Restraint and Seclusion: Resource Document*; (ii) include definitions, criteria for use, restrictions for use, training requirements, notification requirements, reporting requirements, and follow-up requirements; and (iii) address distinctions, including distinctions in emotional and physical development, between (a) the general student population and the special education student population and (b) elementary school students and secondary school students.

- Staff in the Virginia Department of Education's (VDOE) Division of Special Education and Student Services conducted a 50-state survey of legislation and regulations addressing the use of restraint and seclusion in public schools. In addition, staff held several internal meetings to begin to identify key issues for inclusion into these proposed regulations.
- In August, September and October of 2015, the VDOE hosted three informal stakeholder meetings. Each meeting lasted for three hours. Representatives of the following organizations were invited to attend:

Virginia ARC	Virginia Council of Administrators of Special Education
Virginia Board for People with Disabilities	Higher Education Representatives
Virginia Commission on Youth Family Members	Virginia Association of PTAs
Virginia Education Association	Parent Educational Advocacy Training Center
disAbility Law Center	Partnership for People with Disabilities
JustChildren	Virginia Association of Elementary School Principals
Virginia School Boards Association	Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals
Virginia Association of School Superintendents	
- On February 25, 2016, the Board accepted the proposed regulations for first review, but requested guidance from the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) due to the issue discussed below.
- The 2015 statute (HB 1443/SB 782) directs the Board to develop regulations that are consistent with the *15 Principles* articulated in the United States Department of Education's (USDOE) 2012 *Restraint and Seclusion Resource Document* and VDOE's *Guidelines for the Development of Policies and Procedures for Managing Student Behavior in Emergency Situations*.
- The stakeholder groups listed above had lively debates concerning the very definition of restraint and seclusion. The third Principle of the USDOE document states that "physical restraint or seclusion should not be used except in situations where the child's behavior poses imminent danger of serious physical harm to self or others."
- Longstanding law in Virginia—§ 22.1-279.1—provides that the prohibition on the use of corporal punishment in public schools DOES NOT preclude reasonable force to (i) quell a disturbance that threatens serious physical harm or injury to persons or damage to property; (ii) remove a student from the scene of a disturbance that threatens serious physical injury to persons or damage to property; (iii) defend self or others; (v) obtain possession of controlled substances or paraphernalia which are upon the person of the student or within the student's control; (vi) to obtain possession of weapons or other dangerous objects that are upon the person of the student or within the student's control.
- Nowhere do the *15 Principles* address the use of restraint or "reasonable force" regarding damage to property or obtaining drugs, etc., from students—scenarios which, in some cases, may not clearly meet the "imminent danger of serious physical harm to self or others" standard articulated by the *15 Principles*. Parties expressed sharp disagreement as to how the regulations should reconcile current permitted practices with the new statutory mandate.
- In July 2016, the OAG advised the Board that the statutory directive that the VDOE develop regulations consistent with the *15 Principles* did not irreconcilably conflict with the existing permitted practices, and, further, that the proposed regulations appropriately reconciled the two statutes.

- Following receipt of this advice, the VDOE staff conducted three public forums in October 2016, in Stafford County, Botetourt County and Hampton City, respectively, consisting of a facilitated roundtable discussion, followed by an opportunity for public input. Participants and commenters included school personnel, advocacy groups, and parents. Based upon input from stakeholders, the VDOE has made changes to its initial draft based on comments that were common, shared, and uncontroversial. Staff requests that the Board provide guidance on certain other areas that were the subject of significant disagreement.
- These proposed regulations are based on two foundational—and consonant—principles: that schools must be safe for all children and that school personnel must be equipped to address emergencies and disruptions effectively, while protecting the dignity of all students, the integrity of the classroom, and the safety of all persons in our public schools. The proposed regulations attempt to reconcile the two opposing statutes.
- The following is a brief summary of the proposed regulations. Underlined text reflects proposals/considerations resulting from public comment, some of which may require additional guidance from the Board of Education.
 1. Permit, but do not require, school divisions to implement physical restraint and seclusion in public schools. School divisions electing to use physical restraint and seclusion must follow regulations.
 2. Preclude the use of seclusion cells; aversive stimuli; and prone, pharmacological, and mechanical restraints. Based upon public comment, we have added a prohibition on supine restraint to the proposed regulations.
 3. Prohibit the use of physical restraint and seclusion as (i) punishment or discipline; (ii) means of coercion or retaliation; or (iii) convenience.
 4. Exclude from physical restraint: (i) briefly holding student to calm or comfort the student; (ii) holding student's hand or arm to escort the student safely from one area to another; or (iii) use of incidental, minor or reasonable physical contact or other actions designed to maintain order and control.
 5. Create reporting and notification standards for incidents of physical restraint and seclusion.
 1. By the end of the school day, school staff must report incident and first aid to school principal/designee.
 2. Within one calendar day, school principal/designee, other school personnel, or volunteers organized by school administration for this purpose must make reasonable effort to ensure that direct contact is made with parent, either in person or through telephone conversation, to notify parent of incident and any related first aid.
 3. If any pupil has been physically restrained or secluded outside regular school day, notifications shall be made as soon as practicable pursuant to school division's school crisis/emergency management plan.

Based upon comment received by VDOE, reference to volunteers providing the notice was stricken from the proposed regulations. In addition, based on discussions at all three roundtable sessions, the requirement to issue incident reports has been broadened to include all students, not just those in a self-contained or other special education setting.

Parents, advocacy groups and school personnel disagreed sharply on the timelines for notification of the incident. As a result, staff requests guidance from the Board.

6. Establish specifications for seclusion rooms based on Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services Regulations for Children's Residential Facilities 12 VAC 35-46-960. Discussion addressed the specifications for seclusion rooms and the use of sensory objects. VDOE staff also received strong recommendations in favor of banning seclusion altogether.

As seclusion is permitted in emergency circumstances under the 15 Principles and the VDOE Guidelines, staff requests guidance from the Board.

7. Provide for continuous visual monitoring of seclusion and physical restraint.
8. Require all school personnel to have initial evidence-based training in physical restraint and seclusion. Commenters were virtually unanimous that initial training should focus on de-escalation and positive behavior supports, with less emphasis on when restraint and seclusion may be used. Staff has revised the proposed regulations to incorporate these suggestions.
9. Require, when physical restraint and seclusion are used in a self-contained classroom or other special education setting:
 1. Advanced evidence-based training for school personnel assigned to that self-contained classroom.
 2. Debriefing of staff and, where appropriate, students.
 3. Incident reporting to principals, division superintendents, and the Superintendent of Public Instruction.
 4. Copies of incident reports to parents.

Commenters agreed that debriefing should occur and incident reports issued regardless of the setting of the restraint or seclusion. Staff has modified the proposed regulations to incorporate these suggestions.

Stakeholders and commenters were divided on the issue of the level of training required of personnel who do not serve in a self-contained classroom or other special education setting. Accordingly, staff requests guidance on this issue.

10. Establishes follow-up/review following three (3) incidents of physical restraint or seclusion for student in special and general education. IEP/504 team or other school team is to consider need for an FBA and a new or revised BIP that addresses underlying causes or purposes of the behaviors. In response to public comment, staff has revised this section to provide that follow-up occur after two incidents of physical restraint or seclusion, the team may consider other actions, including a referral for special education evaluation or reevaluation. Commenters differed about the triggers, in terms of definition of an incident, and timelines for such review, and accordingly, staff requests guidance from the Board.
11. Requires school divisions to adopt policies/procedures.
12. Cannot be construed to restrict (i) initial authority of teachers to remove students from a classroom; (ii) authority and duties of SROs and SSOs; or (iii) civil immunity afforded teachers employed by local school boards for any acts or omissions resulting from the supervision, care or discipline of students.

VDOE also notes that it heard strong support for eliminating the distinction between incidents occurring in general education setting and self-contained special education settings in all areas except the requirement for advanced training, and we have modified the draft regulations accordingly, as stated above. Participation in these focus groups was heavily weighted toward special educators, parents of students with disabilities, and advocacy groups, and thus we ask the Board for direction regarding the advisability of maintaining such distinctions.

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Wodiska recommended that the VBOE have a brown bag session in November to learn more about the topic of seclusion and restraint to further inform the Board's discussions. Mr. Bellamy and Mrs. Atkinson supported this recommendation.
- Mrs. Atkinson asked to have the analysis of the public comments in advance of the brown bag session. Mr. Eisenberg indicated that the public comment analysis would be available prior to the November meeting.

- Mrs. Lodal indicated her concerns about some of the public comments made at the beginning of the Board meeting. She noted that while school personnel need to have options in addressing student disciplinary issues, the focus should be on prevention of disciplinary problems and how to work effectively with local law enforcement. She acknowledged the work of VDOE staff to make proposed amendments to the regulations based on research.
- Mr. Eisenberg noted questions about whether or not law enforcement officers would be subject to the provisions of the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*.
- Dr. Cannaday asked VBOE members to send staff specific questions/areas they would like to have addressed during the brown bag lunch. He recommended that the VBOE not take action on the regulations in November to allow time to think and react to the proposed revisions to the regulations.
- Mr. Eisenberg suggested an additional review of the proposed regulations in January 2017 with final review in February 2017.

The Board of Education received for second review the proposed *Regulations Governing the Use of Seclusion and Restraint in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools in Virginia*.

H. First Review of Memoranda of Understanding as Required of Schools in Accreditation Denied Status for Twelve School Divisions

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Section **8 VAC 20-131-315** of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) requires certain actions for schools that are denied accreditation:

- A. Any school rated *Accreditation Denied* in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-300 shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and shall provide parents of enrolled students and other interested parties with the following:
1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;
 2. A copy of the school division's proposed corrective action plan, including a timeline for implementation, to improve the school's accreditation rating; and
 3. An opportunity to comment on the division's proposed corrective action plan. Such public comment shall be received and considered by the school division prior to finalizing the school's corrective action plan and a Board of Education memorandum of understanding with the local school board.

- B. Any school rated *Accreditation Denied* in accordance with [8 VAC 20-131-300](#) shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and affirmed through a memorandum of understanding between the Board of Education and the local school board. The local school board shall submit a corrective action plan to the Board of Education for its consideration in prescribing actions in the memorandum of understanding within 45 days of the notification of the rating. The memorandum of understanding shall be entered into no later than November 1 of the academic year in which the rating is awarded.

The local board shall submit status reports detailing implementation of actions prescribed by the memorandum of understanding to the Board of Education. The status reports shall be signed by the school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board. The school principal, division

superintendent, and the chair of the local school board may be required to appear before the Board of Education to present status reports.

The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:

1. Undergoing an educational service delivery and management review. The Board of Education shall prescribe the content of such review and approve the reviewing authority retained by the school division.
2. Employing a turnaround specialist credentialed by the state to address those conditions at the school that may impede educational progress and effectiveness and academic success.

- The following schools are in *Accreditation Denied* status for the first time in 2016-2017 and are subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through Memoranda of Understanding between the VBOE and the local school boards. Memoranda of Understanding are differentiated for each school based on content areas not meeting the accreditation benchmarks and require each school's Corrective Action Plan to be differentiated based on essential actions resulting from the academic review. The data points required by the Memoranda of Understanding may be adjusted according to school needs. Technical assistance required by the Memoranda of Understanding is differentiated based on the needs of the school and the capacity of the Office of School Improvement.

Name of Division	Name of Schools in <i>Accreditation Denied</i> Status
Accomack County Public Schools	Arcadia Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Albemarle County Public Schools	Benjamin F. Yancey Elementary School (Gr. PK-5)
Amherst County Public Schools	Central Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Amherst Country Public Schools	Madison Heights Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Brunswick County Public Schools	Totaro Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Buckingham County Public Schools	Buckingham County Elementary School-(Gr.3-5; Paired School with Buckingham Primary)
Buckingham County Public Schools	Buckingham County Primary School (Gr.K-2; Paired School with Buckingham Elem.)
Chesterfield County Public Schools	Ettrick Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Chesterfield County Public Schools	Falling Creek Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Lunenburg County Public Schools	Kenbridge Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Lunenburg County Public Schools	Victoria Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Lunenburg County Public Schools	Lunenburg Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Lynchburg City Public Schools	T. C. Miller Elementary for Innovation (Gr.PK-5)
Lynchburg City Public Schools	Linkhorne Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Norfolk City Public Schools	Jacox Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Norfolk City Public Schools	James Monroe Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Norfolk City Public Schools	Richard Bowling Elementary School (Gr.PK-5)
Norfolk City Public Schools	Azalea Gardens Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Cradock Middle School (Gr.7-8)
Prince William County Public Schools	Fred M. Lynn Middle School (Gr.6-8)
Richmond City Public Schools	Binford Middle School (Gr.6-8)

- Corrective Action Plans for each of these schools must be developed by February 3, 2017. Listed below is a general description of technical assistance to be included in the Corrective Action Plan.

Technical Assistance

- All schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will participate in technical assistance sessions provided by the Office of School Improvement (OSI). OSI technical assistance sessions for the 2016-2017 school year will focus on the comprehensive needs assessment component of continuous school improvement planning. Additionally schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will have triannual meetings with OSI, the support of an OSI contractor, and the opportunity to select from the newly developed OSI/VDOE Technical Assistance Menu.
- Asset mapping and selected essential actions resulting from academic reviews will be a part of each school's Corrective Action Plan. OSI staff will assist in reviewing essential actions to determine those needed in the Corrective Action Plan. OSI staff will provide technical assistance in using the asset mapping tool and in determining next steps.
- As noted in the individual memoranda of understanding, additional specific technical assistance will be provided by Virginia Department of Education staff to each school rated *Accreditation Denied*.
- Using research-based indicators that lead to increased student achievement is imperative for school improvement. Schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will provide quarterly data reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI) on mutually determined school-level data points. Divisions will meet triannually with the Office of School Improvement to review quarterly report data and collaboratively determine next steps.

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Atkinson noted that this item was discussed thoroughly in the previous day's meeting of the Committee on School and Division Accountability, and there had not been any questions on the Memoranda of Understanding for the school divisions.

Mr. Gecker made a motion to waive first review and approve the Memoranda of Understanding with the following school divisions. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and passed unanimously.

1. Accomack County School Board for Arcadia Middle School
2. Albemarle County School Board for Benjamin F. Yancey Elementary School
3. Amherst County School Board for Central Elementary School and Madison Heights Elementary School
4. Brunswick County School Board for Totaro Elementary School
5. Buckingham County School Board for Buckingham County Primary School and Buckingham County Elementary School
6. Chesterfield County School Board for Ettrick Elementary School and Falling Creek Middle School
7. Lynchburg City School Board for T. C. Miller Elementary for Innovation and Linkhorne Middle School
8. Lunenburg County School Board for Kenbridge Elementary School, Victoria Elementary School, and Lunenburg Middle School
9. Norfolk City School Board for Jacox Elementary School, James Monroe Elementary School, Richard Bowling Elementary School, and Azalea Gardens Middle School
10. Portsmouth City School Board for Cradock Middle School
11. Prince William County School Board for Fred M. Lynn Middle School
12. Richmond City School Board for Binford Middle School

I. First Review of Revised Corrective Action Plan Required by the Division-Level Review for Petersburg City Public Schools

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The Standards of Quality (SOQ) require local school boards to maintain *Fully Accredited* schools and to take corrective actions for schools that are not *Fully Accredited*.

§ [22.1-253.13:3](#). Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation.

...Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards of accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education. Each local school board shall review the accreditation status of all schools in the local school division annually in public session. Within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit corrective action plans for any schools within its school division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the Board.

...When the Board of Education determines through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the Standards of Quality or other division-level action or inaction, the Board may require a division-level academic review. After the conduct of such review and within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit to the Board for approval a corrective action plan, consistent with criteria established by the Board setting forth specific actions and a schedule designed to ensure that schools within its school division achieve full accreditation status. If the Board determines that the proposed corrective action plan is not sufficient to enable all schools within the division to achieve full accreditation, the Board may return the plan to the local school board with directions to submit an amended plan pursuant to Board guidance. Such corrective action plans shall be part of the relevant school division's comprehensive plan pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:6.

- In April 2004, Petersburg City Public Schools and the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) signed an initial division level Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Based on the 2005-2006 assessment results, Petersburg City Public Schools entered into a second MOU on November 20, 2006. On November 17, 2009, the Virginia Board of Education revised the MOU for Petersburg City Public Schools. This MOU was to have remained in effect until all schools were *Fully Accredited*. As required by the MOU, Petersburg City Public Schools developed a corrective action plan beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. An updated corrective action plan was approved by the VBOE on October 24, 2013.
- In fall 2015, the superintendent of Petersburg City Schools resigned and the Petersburg School Board appointed an interim superintendent who began work in Petersburg in early November 2015. In December 2015, teams from the Offices of School Improvement, Special Education Program Improvement, and Student Services conducted an on-site review in Petersburg City Public Schools. One of the purposes of this review was to identify areas of need within Petersburg City schools so that corrective actions could be determined and a revised corrective action plan could be developed. Upon completion of the on-site review, VDOE staff and Petersburg City Schools interim superintendent reviewed the findings from the on-site review and developed a draft revised corrective action plan that reflected needs identified in the on-site review.
- In January 2016 the Petersburg City School Board announced its search for a new superintendent with the goal that a new superintendent would be named prior to the start of the 2016-2017 school year. In

preparation for the appointment of a new superintendent, a revised MOU, was developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education on April 28, 2016. The revised MOU was based on the comprehensive review conducted in December 2015 by VDOE staff and specifies responsibilities of the Petersburg City School Board, the Petersburg superintendent and the Virginia Department of Education. The General Assembly provided additional funding to support executive leadership positions. These funds may be released or withheld by the VDOE based on Petersburg City School Board's compliance with the MOU.

- The new superintendent and VDOE staff met in August 2016 to review the MOU and draft corrective action plan in order to develop a timeline for completing the final version of the corrective action plan.
- The Petersburg City School Board held a Back-to-School Community Meeting on Wednesday, September 14, 2016 at Petersburg High School. Approximately 150 members of the community attended the meeting representing parents, community members, business leaders, the faith community, higher education, teachers, school administrators and central office leaders. Details of the corrective action plan, developed collaboratively by division leadership and the Virginia Department of Education, were provided by school division staff. The participants were divided into five groups where they were asked to reflect on the goals and related essential actions outlined in the division's corrective action plan and to provide feedback. Each group reflected on one of the five goals outlined in the plan. The goals are 1) Implement Quality Instruction and Curricula Alignment; 2) Monitor Human Resource Management System and Retain, Hire, and Develop Quality Leadership Staff and Teachers; 3) Develop, Adopt, and Implement a Unified Strategic Plan/Purpose and Direction; 4) Maintain a Safe and Supportive Environment; and 5) Develop and Implement a Parental Engagement Plan. Central office leaders with responsibility for overseeing the development, implementation, and monitoring of the goals and essential actions served as facilitators. This afforded them the opportunity to hear firsthand the thoughts and ideas of the community. Central office leaders identified ways to incorporate the feedback into the work needed to address the requirements of the corrective action plan. Additionally, the feedback will be shared with the facilitators assisting with the development of the division's strategic plan. Based upon community feedback, five broad corrective action plan goals were developed.
- Essential actions in the Petersburg City Corrective Action Plan are prioritized by date within each of the goal areas. Timelines take into consideration development, implementation, and monitoring of appropriate essential actions. Legislation by the 2016 General Assembly provides the Virginia Board of Education with the authority to withhold At-Risk Add-On funds if there is evidence of lack of adequate and timely progress in implementing the corrective action plan. Ongoing communication between the Petersburg superintendent, the Petersburg division leadership team, and VDOE staff is a key factor in the collaborative work to develop, implement, and monitor the corrective action plan.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the revised Corrective Action Plan required by the division-level review for Petersburg City Public Schools.

J. First Review of Request for Division-Level Review for Richmond City Public Schools

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The Standards of Quality (SOQ) require local school boards to maintain *Fully Accredited* schools and to take corrective actions for schools that are not *Fully Accredited*.

§ [22.1-253.13:3](#), Standard 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation.

...Each local school board shall maintain schools that are fully accredited pursuant to the standards of accreditation as prescribed by the Board of Education. Each local school board shall review the accreditation status of all schools in the local school division annually in public session. Within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit corrective action plans for any schools within its school division that have been designated as not meeting the standards as approved by the Board.

...When the Board of Education determines through the school academic review process that the failure of schools within a division to achieve full accreditation status is related to division-level failure to implement the Standards of Quality or other division-level action or inaction, the Board may require a division-level academic review. After the conduct of such review and within the time specified by the Board of Education, each school board shall submit to the Board for approval a corrective action plan, consistent with criteria established by the Board setting forth specific actions and a schedule designed to ensure that schools within its school division achieve full accreditation status. If the Board determines that the proposed corrective action plan is not sufficient to enable all schools within the division to achieve full accreditation, the Board may return the plan to the local school board with directions to submit an amended plan pursuant to Board guidance. Such corrective action plans shall be part of the relevant school division's comprehensive plan pursuant to § 22.1-253.13:6.

- During school years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, Richmond City division and school leaders and the Director of the Office of Improvement met quarterly to review evidence of progress in selected Richmond City schools and plan next steps. During these meetings, Richmond City staff noted the need to include some division-wide essential actions in school plans. In August 2015, the Richmond City superintendent and Virginia Department of Education staff discussed Richmond data and the benefits of a division-level review. In July 2016, the Richmond City superintendent indicated that division data indicated the need for a division-level review. On October 17, 2016, the Richmond City School Board voted to request a division-level review. With further discussion, it was agreed to proceed with plans for a Richmond City Public Schools division-level review if approved by the Virginia Board of Education. The division-level review will focus on the following five categories: Academics and Student Success, Leadership and Governance, Operations and Governance, Human Resource Leadership, and Community Relations and Communications. These categories will be the areas for developing the division-level Memorandum of Understanding and essential actions in the division-level Corrective Action Plan.
- The following chart contains an overview of school accreditation data for Richmond City Public Schools for the current school year and the previous two school years.

School Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited First Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Second Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Third Year	Number of Partially Accredited: Reconstituted Schools	Number of Schools Denied Accreditation	Total Number Not Fully Accredited	Total Number of Schools	Percent Not Fully Accredited
2016-2017	5	0	3	5*	17*	30	44	68.18%
2015-2016	0	3	14	4	5	26	44	59.09%
2014-2015	6 (2 Provisional-GCI)	15	9	3	1	34	45	75.56%

*Numbers reflect totals based upon Virginia Board of Education's final approval of Superintendent's recommendations for schools requesting *Partially Accredited: Reconstituted School* status.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the Request for a Division-Level Review from Richmond City Public Schools.

K. First Review of the Progress Report on the Development of the Profile of a Virginia Graduate, as Required by SB 336 and HB 895 (2016)

Dr. Cynthia Cave, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Section [22.1-253.13:1.A](#) of the *Code of Virginia (Code)* provides, in part:

“The General Assembly and the Board of Education believe that the fundamental goal of the public schools of the Commonwealth must be to enable each student to develop the skills that are necessary for success in school, preparation for life, and reaching their full potential.”

- Section [22.1-253.13:3.A](#) of the *Code* provides, in part:

“The Board of Education shall promulgate regulations establishing standards for accreditation pursuant to the Administrative Process Act (§ [2.2-4000](#) et seq.), which shall include, but not be limited to, student outcome measures, requirements and guidelines for instructional programs and for the integration of educational technology into such instructional programs, administrative and instructional staffing levels and positions, including staff positions for supporting educational technology, student services, auxiliary education programs such as library and media services, course and credit requirements for graduation from high school, community relations, and the philosophy, goals, and objectives of public education in Virginia.”

- Effective July 1, 2016, § [22.1-253.13:4.D](#) of the *Code* will provide, in part:

D. “In establishing graduation requirements, the Board [of Education] shall:

1. Develop and implement, in consultation with stakeholders representing elementary and secondary education, higher education, and business and industry in the Commonwealth and including parents, policymakers, and community leaders in the Commonwealth, a Profile of a Virginia Graduate that identifies the knowledge and skills that students should attain during high school in order to be successful contributors to the economy of the Commonwealth, giving due consideration to critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship.
2. Emphasize the development of core skill sets in the early years of high school.
3. Establish multiple paths toward college and career readiness for students to follow in the later years of high school. Each such pathway shall include opportunities for internships, externships, and credentialing...

That the graduation requirements established by the Board of Education... shall apply to each student who enrolls in high school as (i) a freshman after July 1, 2018; (ii) a sophomore after July 1, 2019; (iii) a junior after July 1, 2020; or (iv) a senior after July 1, 2021.”

- In 2014, the Board committed to conducting a comprehensive review and revision of the [Regulations Establishing the Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia](#) (Standards of Accreditation or SOA), including student achievement and graduation requirements. Through the work of its Committee

on School and Division Accountability, throughout 2015 and 2016 the Board has discussed and considered information from multiple sources to shape and expand student achievement expectations for graduation and success in multiple areas of life. The Board's objective is to ensure a quality K-12 educational experience that enables all students to be prepared for success in college and/or the workplace, competitive for the jobs of today's and tomorrow's global economy, and contributing citizens.

- The Standards of Learning (SOL) Innovation Committee, the Governor, and the General Assembly have provided support for the development of the Profile. In its November 2015 report, the SOL Innovations Committee included a recommendation that:

The BOE, in collaboration with stakeholders representing K-12 education, institutions of higher education, business and industry, policymakers and community leaders should develop a Profile of a Virginia Graduate. In the development of such a Profile, the BOE should consider the “5 Cs” – critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship – needed for success in the Virginia economy.

- During the 2016 Session, the Governor and the General Assembly supported the development of a *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* through the introduction and adoption of legislation. [SB 336](#) and [HB 895](#) (2016) direct the Board to redefine the expectations of high school graduates in the Commonwealth. These bills amend § [22.1-253.13:4.D](#) of the *Code* to require the Board to:
 1. Develop and implement, in consultation with stakeholders representing elementary and secondary education, higher education, and business and industry in the Commonwealth and including parents, policymakers, and community leaders in the Commonwealth, a *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* that identifies the knowledge and skills that students should attain during high school in order to be successful contributors to the economy of the Commonwealth, giving due consideration to critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship.
 2. Emphasize the development of core skill sets in the early years of high school.
 3. Establish multiple paths toward college and career readiness for students to follow in the later years of high school. Each such pathway shall include opportunities for internships, externships, and credentialing.
- The redefined high school graduation expectations are to be in place for the freshman class of 2018-2019.
- In addition, the 2016 legislation directed the Board of Education to submit a report to the Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education and Health no later than December 1, 2016 on the status of the implementation of the legislation. The report provides a history of the Board's work, presents the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* Framework, and describes areas of consensus reached by the Board with recommendations for implementation to be made by proposed revisions to the Standards of Accreditation.
- The *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* is being developed to describe the knowledge, skills, competencies, and experiences students should attain during their K-12 education to make them “life-ready.” The “Profile” is comprised of four domains: academic content knowledge and application; workplace skills; community engagement and understanding of civic responsibility and governmental structure; and career exploration aligned with personal skills, knowledge, and interests. The Profile is the framework and basis for the Board's revision of graduation requirements that will go into effect for freshmen entering high schools in the fall of the 2018-2019 school year, or the graduating class of 2022.
- Through organization and attendance at roundtables and from planned presentations at committee and Board meetings, the Board has reached out to elicit information and recommendations from students, teachers, parents, counselors, superintendents, principals, coordinators for English Language Learners, school boards, businesses, the military, higher education deans, faculty, and admission directors, career and technical (CTE) centers, education content specialists, the department's advisory CTE council, Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) Academies, and recipients of high school

innovation grants. As result, the Profile continues to be refined, and approaches to implementation discussed.

- At a spring 2016 full day work session, the Board reviewed, amended, and confirmed a draft *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*. Board members emphasized the need to express the Profile in straightforward and easy-to-understand language and provided suggestions for further clarity and revisions. Board members also reviewed and discussed proposals for requirements and credits that would be necessary for graduation as part of the Profile. Areas of consensus were:
 1. Increase Career Exposure, Exploration, and Planning. The Board supported expanding opportunities for career exposure, exploration, and planning for all students.
 2. Increase Internships and Work-Based Learning Experiences for All Students. The Board supported the use of internships and other work-based learning opportunities as a viable means to meet graduation requirements and to earn standard credits.
 3. Expand the Use of Locally-Developed Performance Assessments and Reduce the Number of Verified Credits. The Board supported expanding the use of locally-developed performance assessments for demonstration of content mastery in history and social science, and reducing the number of verified credits needed for both the Advanced Studies and Standard Diplomas to four.
 4. Emphasize the “5 Cs.” The Board supported integrating the key skills of 21st century education – critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship.
- During its deliberations, the Board also identified several other proposals for further development or for possible consideration in the future, including merging the Advanced Studies and Standard Diploma into a single Virginia Diploma; requiring a capstone project or student participation in experiential learning for graduation; increasing the expectations in mathematics for all students; alternative approaches to science coursework design; and career specific courses/competencies for delivery within traditional core content areas for standard credits.
- At its September 2016 meeting, the Board considered for first review amendments to the Standards of Accreditation that will be necessary in order to implement the Profile. The Profile and subsequent changes in the regulations for requirements for graduation will become driving factors in further reforms to the state’s assessment and accountability systems.

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Atkinson suggested clarification in the report that there are areas where the Board did not reach consensus and they may need to revisit them in the future.
- Dr. Cannaday noted that as discussion and implementation of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate* evolve, there may be other areas that emerge that will need to be addressed. He also expressed concern about the implementation timeline, especially where resources are required. He noted that the SOL Innovation Committee indicated that the VBOE could come back with some suggestions about implementation, and he felt this may be necessary in several areas, including local alternative assessments as they relate to the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, professional development for teachers related to the five Cs, and clarification of which teachers need the professional development, i.e., all teacher, not just core teachers.
- Mrs. Atkinson expressed concern about localities’ capacity to gear up to help students meet the requirements of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, especially related to creating experiential learning experiences for students based on the kinds of businesses available in the localities.
- Mr. Bellamy asked if there would be an alternative for students who do not have access to internships. Dr. Staples noted there is a continuum approach for experiences for students. At one end of the continuum may be intense experiences such as

internships and apprenticeships. At the other end are activities such as career day, job shadowing, or community members speaking to students about job opportunities. School divisions can find ways to meet the requirement based on the resources they have available to them.

- Mrs. Lodal agreed with the continuum approach for implementation of various aspects of the *Profile of a Virginia Graduate*.

The Board of Education received for first review the *Progress Report on the Development of the Profile of a Virginia Graduate*, as required by Senate Bill 336 and House Bill 895 (2016).

L. First Review of Proposed English Standards of Learning

Ms. Tracy Robertson, English coordinator, Office of Humanities and Early Childhood, Division of Instruction, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- New academic content *Standards of Learning* for English were first developed in 1995. They were revised in 2002 and again in 2010. The *Standards of Quality* require the Board of Education to review the *Standards of Learning* on a regular schedule. The current English Standards of Learning were adopted in 2010 and are scheduled for review in 2017. As a result, on January 28, 2016, the Board received a plan to review these standards during the 2016-2017 academic year. In accordance with the plan, the Department of Education took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:
 - Received online comments regarding the 2010 *English Standards of Learning* from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators, which are summarized below;
 - Met with a review committee that consisted of English Language Arts educators and supervisors on July 18 – 21, 2016, to review the public comments and consider documents such as the National Council of Teachers of English and the International Reading Association (now the International Literacy Association) *Standards for the English Language Arts*, the Reading Framework for the 2015 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the Writing Framework for the 2017 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2012 Reading Framework, Virginia Workplace Readiness Skills, states that most recently adopted new English standards including Nebraska (2014), Texas (2010), Oklahoma (2015), and Profile of a Virginia Graduate and the 5Cs;
 - Facilitated the creation of a secure website allowing a committee of external stakeholders representing institutions of higher education, the Library of Virginia, and the Virginia Conference of English Educators to review and comment on the work of the SOL Revision Committee on the draft of Proposed English Standards;
 - Received feedback from the Office of Career, Technical, and Adult Education; the Student Assessment Office; the Office of Special Education Instructional Services; and Rolls-Royce, Center for Advanced Manufacturing;
 - Requested feedback from business community members including those who were members of a panel discussion at the May 24, 2016, BOE Committee on School and Division Accountability including Virginia Poultry Federation; Web Teks; Capital One Financial Corporation; Dominion Resources, and Advanced Integrated Manufacturing at Thomas Nelson Community College; and
 - Developed the draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*.
- A total of 29 comments were received online from individuals and groups on the 2010 *English Standards of Learning* in Kindergarten through Grade 12 during the 30-day public comment period from February 1, 2016 through March 1, 2016. Nineteen of the comments were concerning the SOL assessments.
- The comments submitted for K-5 included:
 - Include lists of roots, affixes, homophones, and vocabulary to be taught at each grade level
 - Clarify the meaning of text features vs text structures
 - Increase end of kindergarten readiness expectations

- Add an editing standard to first grade
 - Define the difference between main idea and theme
 - Clarify what is meant by author's style
 - Eliminate guide words
- The comments submitted for 6-12 included:
 - Create a common root list
 - Include digital citizenship and 21st century literacies
 - Remove narrative writing from 7th grade
 - Use only Modern Language Association (MLA) documentation rather than a choice between MLA and American Psychological Association (APA)
 - Include more specific grammar skills in high school
 - Divide reading standards into fiction, informational, and functional text types rather than fiction and nonfiction
 - Add symbols to 7th grade
- The Proposed *English Standards of Learning* are the first standards to be revised using the guidelines of the Profile of a Virginia Graduate. The Profile, developed by the Board of Education, describes knowledge, skills, competencies, and experiences students should attain during their K-12 education to make them "life-ready." The Profile is comprised of four overlapping areas considered to be essential for success beyond high school: content knowledge; workplace skills; community engagement and civic responsibility; career exploration. The goals of the *English Standards of Learning*, teaching students to read, write, research and communicate, align with the four components of the Profile of a Virginia Graduate and include the foundational skills of critical thinking, creative thinking, collaboration, communication, and citizenship. Students should be prepared to participate in society as literate citizens, equipped with the ability to think analytically, solve problems, communicate effectively, and collaborate with diverse groups in their communities, in the workplace, and in postsecondary education. Although the strands are developed separately, they are expected to be seamlessly integrated in the classroom. Without a required reading list for English, school divisions have always had the flexibility to design their local curricula to best meet the needs of their students including the exploration of career paths and using technical texts. Through the rigorous application of the English Standards of Learning, students become critical thinkers, effective contributors, and global citizens.
- The draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* consists of the following elements:

Introduction

The goals of the English Standards of Learning are to teach students to read, write, research and communicate. Although the strands are developed separately, they are expected to be seamlessly integrated in the classroom. Through the rigorous application of the English Standards of Learning, students become critical thinkers, effective contributors, and global citizens.

The proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* were developed with the assistance of educators, academic experts, librarians, representatives from professional organizations, business leaders, and others with an interest in public education.

Strands

The *English Standards of Learning* are grouped into the following strands that address related content and skills: Communication and Multimodal Literacies, Reading, Writing, Research

Standards

The *English Standards of Learning* for Virginia public schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12.

Summary of the Proposed Revised *English Standards of Learning*

- The major elements of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* include:
 - Alignment and inclusion of the 5Cs: Critical Thinking, Creative Thinking, Communication,

Collaboration, and Citizenship;

- Alignment to the applicable skills within the Virginia Workplace Readiness Skills;
- Reorganization of the K-3 Standards to fully align with the 4-12 Standards and reflect a seamless alignment of the *English Standards of Learning* from kindergarten through Grade 12;
- Reorganizing the early literacy skills formerly under an Oral Language strand to the Reading strand ensuring that students receive the strong foundation of phonological and phonemic awareness to become fluent readers;
- Creating a Communication strand in K-3, which will focus on the necessary skills to express needs, ask questions, work collaboratively, and present information;
- Creating a Research strand in K-3, which previously began in Grade 4. At the primary level, students will begin to conduct research and use available resources to answer questions, solve problems, and organize information;
- Renaming the Communication: Speaking, Listening, and Media Literacy strand to Communication and Multimodal Literacies to reflect the integration of multiple modes of communication and expression, digital citizenship, and current best practices;
- Expansion of cursive writing standards in grades 2 and 3;
- Expansion of technical reading and writing in grades 9-12;
- Introduction of reflective writing in grades 6-12;
- Expansion of skills for collaboration, consensus-building, team-building, and working toward common goals;
- Creation of standards in reading requiring comparing/contrasting details in literary and informational nonfiction texts;
- Expansion of requirements for nonfiction/informational/technical reading in grades 4-12;
- Emphasis on ethical use of the Internet when gathering and using information;
- Introduction of a focus on a mode or modes of writing at each grade level, increasing in complexity and rigor as students progress through K-12; and
- Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, rigor, alignment of skills and content, and a reflection of the current academic research and practice.

Board discussion:

- Dr. Cannaday suggested that in January 2017, there be a work session on the *English Standards of Learning* for VBOE members. Mrs. Lodal suggested several topics to be addressed during the January session, including guide words, narrative writing, style manuals, reflective writing, the role of drama, and the focus on non-fiction and interdisciplinary studies. She recommended review of a book on numeracy by Paulos for mathematics integration.
- Mr. Bellamy asked about Standards 9.4 and 9.5 and whether there was a preferred reading list. Mrs. Robertson responded that there was not a preferred or required reading list. Mr. Bellamy asked about ways to encourage school divisions to diversify their reading lists. Mrs. Robertson noted that world, ethnic, and minority literature are required but that title choices are left to school divisions. Mr. Bellamy hoped that additional work might be done in this area to promote student exposure to more diverse bodies of literature.
- Mrs. Wodiska thanked staff for their work on the *English Standards of Learning*. In January, she would like to know more about:
 - Why students were not required to write for a workplace audience earlier than Grade 10 given the importance placed on career exploration for younger students; and
 - Why Internet ethics was not discussed prior to Grade 8 given that plagiarism was addressed much earlier.
- Dr. Cannaday complimented the staff on their work and asked VBOE members to

submit further questions for the January session.

The Board of Education received for first review the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*.

M. First Review of Proposed Revisions to the Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Students, House Bill 954 Passed by the 2016 General Assembly

Mr. Eric Rhoades, director, Office of Science and Health Education, Division of Instruction, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The 2016 Acts of Assembly (House Bill [HB 954](#)) require the Virginia Board of Education (Board) to amend the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes* to require each local school division's policies and procedures regarding the identification and handling of suspected concussions in student-athletes to include a "Return to Learn Protocol" that requires school personnel to be alert to cognitive and academic issues that may be experienced by a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury, including: (i) difficulty with concentration, organization, and long-term and short-term memory; (ii) sensitivity to bright lights and sounds; and (iii) short-term problems with speech and language, reasoning, planning, and problem solving. The school division's policies must accommodate the gradual return to full participation in academic activities of a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury as appropriate, based on the recommendation of the student's licensed health care provider as to the appropriate amount of time that such student needs to be away from the classroom. The bill also broadens the scope of the "Return to Learn Protocol" in the Board of Education's guidelines for school division policies and procedures on concussions in student-athletes to require school personnel to: (a) be alert to cognitive and academic issues that may be experienced by a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury; and (b) accommodate the gradual return to full participation in academic activities of a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury. Under current law, the "Return to Learn Protocol" only imposes such requirements on school personnel with respect to student-athletes.
- The guidelines are codified in § [22.1-271.5](#), and § [22.1-271.6](#) of the Code of Virginia. The legislation states in part:

§ [22.1-271.5](#). Policies on concussions in student-athletes.

... 3. Include a "Return to Learn Protocol" with the following requirements:

a. School personnel shall be alert to cognitive and academic issues that may be experienced by a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury, including (i) difficulty with concentration, organization, and long-term and short-term memory; (ii) sensitivity to bright lights and sounds; and (iii) short-term problems with speech and language, reasoning, planning, and problem solving; and

b. School personnel shall accommodate the gradual return to full participation in academic activities of a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury as appropriate, based on the recommendation of the student's licensed health care provider as to the appropriate amount of time that such student needs to be away from the classroom.

§ [22.1-271.6](#). School division policies and procedures on concussions in students.

The Board of Education shall amend its guidelines for school division policies and procedures on concussions in student-athletes to include a "Return to Learn Protocol" with the following requirements:

1. School personnel shall be alert to cognitive and academic issues that may be experienced by a ~~student-athlete~~ student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury, including (i) difficulty with concentration, organization, and long-term and short-term memory; (ii) sensitivity to bright lights and sounds; and (iii) short-term problems with speech and language, reasoning, planning, and problem solving;

and

2. School personnel shall accommodate the gradual return to full participation in academic activities ~~by~~ of a ~~student-athlete~~ *student* who has suffered a concussion or other head injury as appropriate, based on the recommendation of the ~~student-athlete's~~ *student's* licensed health care provider as to the appropriate amount of time that such ~~student-athlete~~ *student* needs to be away from the classroom.

- The *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes* were first enacted by the 2010 General Assembly when it amended the *Code of Virginia* to include §22.1-271.5 directing the Board of Education to develop and distribute to school divisions by July 1, 2011, guidelines for policies dealing with concussions in student-athletes that defined appropriate licensed health care providers authorized to evaluate and provide written clearance for return to play; required each school division to develop policies and procedures to inform and educate coaches, student-athletes and their parents or guardians on the risks, and short- and long-term health effects of concussions; established criteria for removal from and return to play, and the risks for not reporting the injury and continuing to play; and provided guidance for the identification and handling of suspected concussions in student-athletes allowing for adequate time to heal, and providing comprehensive support until the student-athlete is symptom free.
- The 2014 Acts of Assembly ([House Bills 410](#) and [1096](#) and [Senate Bill 172](#)) required the Virginia Board of Education to amend the [Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes](#) to include information on the effects of concussions on student-athletes' academic performance and "Return to Learn Protocols"; and define "non-interscholastic youth sports program" and require such programs utilizing public school property to either (i) establish policies and procedures regarding the identification and handling of suspected concussions in student-athletes, consistent with either the local school division's policies or the Board's guidelines or (ii) follow the local school division's policy.
- On January 22, 2015, the Board of Education adopted the [Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes](#). During the 2015 General Assembly Session, legislation was introduced ([House Bill 2006](#)) and ([Senate Bill 998](#)) that would have required each local school division to establish a management plan for implementation of and compliance with its policies and procedures on the identification and handling of suspected concussions in student-athletes. The Senate Education and Health Committee and the House Education Committee members reviewed these bills, determined that further study of this issue would be appropriate, and requested the Commission on Youth to study the provisions set forth in the legislation.
- In 2011, 2014 and 2015, a wide variety of stakeholders and constituents assisted with the revision to the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes*. As specified in enactment clause three of § [22.1-271.5](#), the Board of Education worked with the Virginia High School League, the Department of Health, the Virginia Athletic Trainers Association, representatives of the Children's Hospital of the King's Daughters and the Children's National Medical Center, the Brain Injury Association of Virginia, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Virginia College of Emergency Physicians and other interested stakeholders in conducting the research necessary for the development of the guidelines and definitions related to policies on concussion in student-athletes.
- The 2016 Acts of Assembly require the Board of Education to broaden the scope of the "Return to Learn Protocol" for school division policies and procedures on concussions to include *all* students and require school personnel to: (a) be alert to cognitive and academic issues that may be experienced by a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury; and (b) accommodate the gradual return to full participation in academic activities of a student who has suffered a concussion or other head injury.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the proposed revisions to the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Students* to replace the *Guidelines for Policies on Concussions in Student-Athletes* adopted by the Board on January 22, 2015.

N. First Review of Proposed Amendments to the Regulations Governing Nutritional Guidelines for Competitive Foods Available for Sale in the Public Schools (Final Stage)

Mr. Kent Dickey, deputy superintendent for finance and operations and Ms. Lynne Fellin, associate director, Office of School Nutrition Programs, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Senate Bill 414 (2010 Acts of Assembly) amended the *Code of Virginia* by adding Section 22.1-207.4 on nutritional guidelines for competitive foods. This legislation required the Board of Education, in cooperation with the Department of Health, to promulgate and periodically update regulations setting nutritional guidelines for all competitive foods sold to students during regular school hours that are not part of the federal school lunch or school breakfast program. The term “competitive foods” refers to all foods available for sale to students on the school campus during the school day other than meals reimbursed under programs authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (i.e., School Lunch and School Breakfast). The regulations to be developed pursuant to the legislation are required to address calorie, fat, sugar, and sodium content, and may address other areas. Re-proposed regulations have been moving through the Administrative Process Act (APA) process.
- As specified in enactment clause three of SB 414, the Board of Education shall work with the Department of Health, the School Nutrition Association of Virginia, the American Heart Association, the American Cancer Society, the Virginia chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Virginia Wholesalers and Distributors Association, the Virginia Automatic Merchandising Association, and other stakeholders in conducting the research necessary for the development of the regulations and in the dissemination of the nutritional guidelines to school divisions.
- Further, SB 414 requires in the development and implementation of the regulations that:
 - Nutritional guidelines be established for all foods available for sale to students on school grounds during regular school hours. “Competitive food” means all foods available for sale to students on the school campus during the school day other than meals reimbursed under the school breakfast or school lunch programs. In the school setting, these are typically food items available for sale to students as à la carte items in the cafeteria, in vending machines, in school stores/snack bars, and through other school activities. SB 414 explicitly excludes “beverages” under the definition of “competitive food.” In addition, food items served or provided, but not sold, to students, or those sold outside regular school hours or off the school campus are outside the purview of these regulations;
 - The guidelines be based on the Institute of Medicine's (IOM) nutrition standards for competitive foods in schools or the competitive food guidelines established by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation as the initial statewide standard for competitive foods;
 - The guidelines be periodically reviewed by the Board of Education with assistance from the Department of Health to ensure they remain current, science-based, and consistent with any changes to the federal laws or regulations on competitive foods; and
 - Local school boards adopt the state guidelines as part of their existing local wellness policy to ensure compliance with the provisions of subsection A of Section 22.1-207.4.
- The Department of Education conducted meetings with the above stakeholders on March 24, April 21, and May 25, 2011, to develop draft nutrition guidelines. The National Academy of Sciences’ Institute of Medicine’s Nutrition Standards for Foods in Schools: Leading the Way to a Healthier Youth was used as the basis for the nutritional standards in the proposed regulations. The IOM standards were used since it was anticipated that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) would use them in developing its own nutritional standards for competitive foods, as it was authorized to do under the 2010 federal legislation that reauthorized the federal school meal programs (Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010). The federal competitive food regulations were developed based on the IOM standards. Consistent with SB 414 and the core nutrition components in the IOM standards, the initially proposed Board regulations set nutritional standards for competitive foods sold to students in the areas of calorie, fat, sugar, sodium content, and foods of minimal nutritional value.

- On June 28, 2013, USDA issued the interim final rule, *National School Lunch and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 (Smart Snacks in Schools rule)*. The interim final rule amended the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program regulations to establish nutrition standards for all foods available for sale to students in schools during the school day on the school campus other than meals reimbursed under programs authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. These new federal regulations governing competitive foods became effective July 1, 2014. The final rule was issued by USDA in September 2016.
- The initially proposed regulations for Virginia schools were presented to the Board of Education for first review on June 23, 2011. The Board accepted these proposed regulations for first review and authorized the Department of Education to proceed with the next steps of the regulatory process under the Administrative Process Act (APA), including a public comment period and a public hearing.
- SB 414 required the guidelines to be periodically reviewed by the Board of Education to ensure they remain current, science-based, and consistent with any changes to the federal laws or regulations on competitive foods. In light of this requirement, and the comments received at both the public hearing conducted on October 24, 2013, and during the public comment period, the proposed regulations were reviewed and revised to align with the USDA interim and now final rule, *Smart Snacks in Schools*. Due to the significant changes in the language of the initial proposed regulations, the regulations were re-proposed and subject to the steps of the regulatory process under the Administrative Process Act (APA), including public comment.
- Through HB 2114, the 2015 General Assembly further amended Section 22.1-207.4 to allow schools to conduct up to 30 school-sponsored fundraisers that would be exempt from the nutrition standards outlined in these regulations, as allowable in the federal *Smart Snacks in Schools* regulations. The Board of Education initially implemented this amendment to the legislation by a Resolution, 2015-34, passed on November 22, 2015, pending proposing further amendments to the regulations to incorporate language governing fundraiser exemptions.
- The language in this final stage of the regulations is updated to align with the federal *Smart Snacks in Schools* regulations governing competitive foods available to students during the school day to provide clarity and consistency in state and federal regulations. These revised regulations also incorporate the fundraising exemptions allowed by the federal regulations, mandated by the General Assembly, and initially implemented by a Board of Education resolution in November 2015. The Virginia Regulatory Town Hall Final Regulation Agency Background Document that provides additional background on the latest proposed changes to the regulations has been completed. The latest proposed changes to the regulations include the following:

Section number	What has changed	Description of change	Rationale
8VAC 20-740-10	Added definitions for fundraisers, fundraising exemptions, and regular school hours.	<p>““Fundraiser” means a school-sponsored activity where food or non-food items are sold on the school campus during regular school hours by the school-sponsored organization to raise money for a school related program or activity. One fundraiser is defined as one or more fundraising activities by one or more school-sponsored organizations that last one school day.”</p> <p>““Fundraising Exemption” means an exception that allows the sale of food or beverages by a school-sponsored organization on the school campus during regular school hours that do not meet the nutrition standards established in this</p>	Required by legislation to include fundraisers.

Section number	What has changed	Description of change	Rationale
		<p>regulation and items that do not meet the United States Department of Agriculture's <i>Smart Snacks in Schools</i> regulation. Fundraisers that sell non-food items, or that sell foods or beverages that meet the nutrition standards, are not subject to these regulations."</p> <p>"Regular school hours" means the standard school day, as defined in 8VAC20-131-5, except, for the purpose of fundraiser exemptions, breaks for meals and recess are included in the regular school hours."</p>	
8VAC 20-740-20	Applicability: D.4. was expanded to address the exempt fundraisers.	"...for exempt fundraisers as outlined in section 8VAC20-740-40 of this regulation."	Required by legislation to include fundraisers.
8VAC 20-740-40	Moved Implementation and Compliance to a new section 8VAC 20-740-50 to insert a new section at 8VAC 20-740-40 - Exemptions to the Nutrition Standards for School-sponsored Fundraisers.	<p>This change was to renumber a previously existing section of the regulations and to insert a new section of regulations to address exemptions for school-sponsored fundraisers.</p> <p>"Fundraisers</p> <p>A. Each public school shall be permitted to conduct, on the school campus during regular school hours, no more than 30 school-sponsored fundraisers per school year during which food or beverages that do not meet the nutrition guidelines in these regulations or in the USDA regulations may be sold to students. School divisions are not required to allow exemptions to these nutrition standards for school-sponsored fundraisers and may implement more restrictive guidelines as part of the local wellness policy requirements outlined in 8VAC 20-740-50 A.</p> <p>B. One fundraiser is defined as one or more fundraising activities that last one school day. If multiple school-sponsored organizations conduct fundraisers on the same day, the combined activities shall be counted as one fundraiser. If a fundraising activity lasts more than one school day, each subsequent day's activity shall be considered as one fundraiser and shall count toward the 30 exempt fundraisers total per year.</p> <p>C. Any fundraiser that sells food or beverages, whether the items meet the nutrition standards or are exempt from the nutrition standards, may not be conducted during school meal service times.</p> <p>Pursuant to current Board of Education regulations for the School Breakfast Program (8VAC20-580-10 et seq.) and the Regulations Governing School Lunch Sale of Food Items (8VAC20-290-10), any food or beverage items cannot be sold in competition with the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast</p>	Required by legislation to include fundraisers.

Section number	What has changed	Description of change	Rationale
		Program from 6 a.m. until after the close of the last breakfast period and from the beginning of the first lunch period to the end of the last lunch period. Pursuant to these regulations, the income from any food or beverage sold to students during these times shall accrue to the non-profit School Nutrition Program account. D. An exemption is not required for non-food fundraisers or for fundraisers that sell food or beverage items that meet the nutrition standards.”	
8VAC 20-740-50	Added two sentences related to implementation of the fundraiser exemptions.	LEAs “c. shall be responsible for maintaining records each school year documenting the number of exempt fundraisers conducted at each school within the LEA.” The Department “... shall provide guidance to schools on alternative school-sponsored fundraisers that do not involve the sale of foods or beverages to students and guidance on how to determine if foods and beverages sold at school-sponsored fundraisers meet these standards.”	Required by legislation to include fundraisers.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the proposed amendments to the *Regulations Governing Nutritional Guidelines for Competitive Foods Available for Sale in the Public Schools* (Final Stage).

O. First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure’s Recommendation to Grant Approval to Add New Education (Endorsement) Programs at Shenandoah University and Washington and Lee University (Rockbridge Teacher Education Consortium)

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*, in part, stipulate the following:

<p><u>8VAC20-542-20. Administering the regulations.</u></p> <p>D. Institutions of higher education seeking approval of an education program shall be accredited by a regional accrediting agency....</p> <p>H. Education programs shall be approved under these regulations biennially based on compliance with the criteria described in 8VAC20-542-40....</p> <p><u>8VAC20-542-40. Standards for biennial approval of education programs.</u></p> <p>Approved education programs in Virginia shall have national accreditation or be accredited by a process approved by the Board of Education and demonstrate achievement biennially of the following accountability measures:</p>
--

1. Candidate progress and performance on prescribed Board of Education licensure assessments. Candidate passing rates, reported by percentages, shall not fall below 70 percent biennially for individuals completing and exiting the program. Achievement of an 80 percent biennial passing rate shall be required by July 1, 2010. Candidates completing a program shall have successfully completed all coursework, required assessments, including those prescribed by the Board of Education, and supervised student teaching or internship. Candidates exiting a program shall have successfully completed all coursework, regardless of whether the individuals attempted, passed, or failed required assessments, including those prescribed by the Board of Education, and/or who may not have completed supervised student teaching or required internship.
2. Candidate progress and performance on an assessment of basic skills as prescribed by the Board of Education for individuals seeking entry into an approved education preparation program....
3. Structured and integrated field experiences to include student teaching requirements....
4. Evidence of opportunities for candidates to participate in diverse school settings that provide experiences with populations that include racial, economic, linguistic, and ethnic diversity throughout the program experiences....
5. Evidence of contributions to PreK-12 student achievement by candidates completing the program....
6. Evidence of employer job satisfaction with candidates completing the program....
7. Partnerships and collaborations based on PreK-12 school needs....

- Shenandoah University and Washington and Lee University (Rockbridge Teacher Education Consortium) submitted requests to add new education (endorsement) programs in the areas noted on the following chart:

Institution	Endorsement Program Requested	Level of Program
Shenandoah University	• Reading Specialist	Graduate
	• Early Childhood for Three-and-Four Year Olds (Add-on-Endorsement)	Graduate
Washington and Lee University (Rockbridge Teacher Education Consortium)	• Music Education-Vocal/Choral PreK-12	Undergraduate

- Program endorsement competencies, based on the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* (8VAC20-542-10 et seq.), have been verified through the review of course descriptions and syllabi to determine alignment with each of the competencies required, including supervised classroom instruction. A review of the *Request for New Endorsement Program* application submitted by the institution evidenced written documentation of school division demand data, as well as institutional and school division support for the requested programs.
- Section 8VAC20-542-40 of the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* requires institutions seeking education (endorsement) program approval to establish partnerships and collaborations based on PreK-12 school needs. The institution of higher education will submit a biennial report for the education (endorsement) programs for the period of September 1, 2017 to August 31, 2019.

Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation

- On September 19, 2016, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approved a recommendation to the Board of Education to grant approval to add new education (endorsement) programs at Shenandoah University and Washington and Lee University (Rockbridge Teacher Education Consortium), including the accountability measurement of partnerships and collaborations based on PreK-12 school needs for each of the programs.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation to grant approval to add new education (endorsement) programs at Shenandoah University (Reading Specialist and Early Childhood for Three-and-Four Year Olds (Add-on-Endorsement)); and Washington and Lee University (Rockbridge Teacher Education Consortium) (Music Education-Vocal/Choral PreK-12).

P. First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation to Amend the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel to Comply with House Bill 261 of the 2016 Virginia General Assembly (Fast Track)

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The 2016 General Assembly passed House Bill 261 that requires the Board of Education to provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any former member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has received an honorable discharge and has the appropriate level of experience or training but does not meet the requirements for a renewable license.

CHAPTER 389

An Act to amend and reenact § [22.1-298.1](#) of the Code of Virginia, relating to former members of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard; provisional teaching licenses.

[\[H 261\]](#)

Approved March 11, 2016

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That § [22.1-298.1](#) of the Code of Virginia is amended and reenacted as follows:

§ [22.1-298.1](#). Regulations governing licensure.

....

G. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board (i) may provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, pursuant to subdivision D 7 or to any person who does not meet the requirements of this section or any other requirement for licensure imposed by law and (ii) shall provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any former member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has received an honorable discharge and has the appropriate level of experience or training but does not meet the requirements for a renewable license...

- As required in House Bill 261 of the 2016 Virginia General Assembly, the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* must be revised to provide for the issuance of a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any former member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has received an honorable discharge and has the appropriate level of experience or training but does not meet the requirements for a renewable license.
- On September 19, 2016, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approved a recommendation to the Board of Education to amend the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* to

comport with House Bill 261 as follows:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE *LICENSURE REGULATIONS FOR SCHOOL
PERSONNEL TO CONFORM TO HOUSE BILL 261 OF THE
2016 GENERAL ASSEMBLY***

8VAC20-22-90. Alternate Routes to Licensure.

...

F. Alternate route for a former member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has received an honorable discharge. An alternate route is available to military veterans who have received an honorable discharge and who are seeking a Provisional (Veteran) License. Individuals must complete the requirements for the five-year license within the validity period of the Provisional (Veteran) License.

An individual seeking a Provisional License through the veteran alternate route must meet the following requirements:

- a. Are entering the teaching field through the alternate route to licensure upon the recommendation of the Virginia employing educational agency. If the veteran is not employed, a statement of the individual's eligibility for a Provisional (Veteran) License will be provided.
- b. Hold a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited college or university with the exception of individuals seeking the Technical Professional License; and
- c. Have met the appropriate level of experience or training required for the teaching endorsement area. The veteran may meet the endorsement requirements by passing a rigorous academic subject test prescribed by the Board of Education, if applicable. This testing option does not apply to individuals who are seeking an early/primary preK-3 or elementary education preK-6 endorsement or who are seeking a technical professional license, vocational evaluator license, pupil personnel services license, school manager license, or division superintendent license.
- d. Every teacher seeking an initial license in the Commonwealth with an endorsement in the area of career and technical education shall have an industry certification credential in the area in which the teacher seeks endorsement. If a teacher seeking an initial license in the Commonwealth has not attained an industry certification credential in the area in which the teacher seeks endorsement, the Board may, upon request of the employing school division or educational agency, issue the teacher a provisional license to allow time for the teacher to attain such credential.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommended amendments to the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* to provide for a provisional license, valid for a period not to exceed three years, to any former member of the Armed Forces of the United States or the Virginia National Guard who has received an honorable discharge and has the appropriate level of experience or training but does not meet the requirements for a renewable license.

O. First Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation to Amend the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel to Comply with House Bill 279 of the 2016 Virginia General Assembly (Exempt Action)*

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The 2016 General Assembly passed House Bill 279 that requires the Board of Education to provide for the issuance of a three-year license to qualified individuals to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average. [The bill references adding Section 22.1-299.5 to the *Code of Virginia*; however, the section added to the *Code of Virginia* is [22.1-299.6](#).]

CHAPTER 651

An Act to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered [22.1-299.5](#), relating to career and technical education; three-year licenses.*

*§ [22.1-299.6](#) of the *Code of Virginia* was added to establishing this license.

[\[H 279\]](#)

Approved April 1, 2016

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a section numbered § [22.1-299.6](#) [**changed to reflect accurate Code section**] as follows:

§§ [22.1-299.6](#). [**changed to reflect accurate Code section**] *Career and technical education; three-year licenses.*

A. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the Board shall provide for the issuance of three-year licenses to qualified individuals to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average.

B. The Board shall issue a three-year license to teach high school career and technical education courses in a specific subject area to an individual who:

1. Submits an application to the Board, in the form prescribed by the Board, that includes a recommendation for such a license from the local school board;

2. Meets certain basic conditions for licensure as prescribed by the Board;

3. Meets one of the following requirements: (i) holds, at a minimum, a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and has completed coursework in the career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach, (ii) holds the required professional license in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach, where applicable, or (iii) holds an industry certification credential, as that term is defined in § [22.1-298.1](#), in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach;

4. Has at least four years of full-time work experience or its equivalent in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach; and

5. Has obtained qualifying scores on the communication and literacy professional teacher's assessment prescribed by the Board.

C. The employing school board shall assign a mentor to supervise an individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section during his first year of teaching.

D. Except as otherwise provided in subsection E, any individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section may be granted subsequent three-year extensions of such license by the Board upon recommendation of the local school board.

E. Any individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section who completes (i) nine semester hours of specialized professional studies credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education or (ii) an alternative course of professional studies proposed by the local school board and approved by the Department of Education shall be granted a three-year extension of such license by the Board and may be granted subsequent three-year extensions of such license by the Board upon recommendation of the local school board. Any such specialized professional studies credit or alternative course of professional studies may be completed through distance learning programs and shall include human growth and development; curriculum, instructional, and technology procedures; and classroom and behavior management.

F. No three-year license issued by the Board pursuant to this section shall be deemed a provisional license or a renewable license, as those terms are defined in § [22.1-298.1](#).

G. Individuals issued a three-year license pursuant to this section shall not be eligible for continuing contract status while teaching under such license and shall be subject to the probationary terms of employment specified in § [22.1-303](#).

H. The provisions of this article and of Board regulations governing the denial, suspension, cancellation, revocation, and reinstatement of licensure shall apply to three-year licenses issued pursuant to this section.

I. The Board shall report at least triennially to the Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education and Health on the issuance of three-year licenses pursuant to this section by high school, local school division, and career and technical education subject area.

- The *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* must be revised to provide for the issuance of a three-year license to qualified individuals to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average.
- On September 19, 2016, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure approved a recommendation to the Board of Education to amend the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* to comport with House Bill 279 of the 2016 Virginia General Assembly as follows:

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE LICENSURE REGULATIONS FOR SCHOOL
PERSONNEL TO CONFORM TO
HOUSE BILL 279 OF THE 2016 GENERAL ASSEMBLY
(Reference: Section 22.1-299.6 of the *Code of Virginia*)**

8VAC20-22-10. Definitions.

Part I. Definitions

The following words and terms when used in this chapter shall have the following meanings indicated unless the context clearly implies otherwise:

"Accredited institution" means an institution of higher education accredited by a regional accrediting agency recognized by the United States Department of Education.

"Alternate route to licensure" means a nontraditional route to licensure available to individuals who meet the criteria specified in 8VAC20-22-90.

"Approved program" means a professional education program recognized as meeting state standards for

the content and operation of such programs so graduates of the program will be eligible for state licensure. The Board of Education has the authority to approve programs in Virginia.

"Cancellation" means the withdrawal of a teaching license following the voluntary return of the license by the license holder.

"Career and technical education (three-year) license means a nonrenewable license issued for a three-year validity period to individuals to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average, and who meet the specific criteria specified in 8VAC20-22-50. Individuals issued this license shall not be eligible for continuing contract status while teaching under such license. The Board shall report at least triennially to the Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education and Health on the issuance of these three-year licenses..."

8VAC20-22-50. Types of Licenses; Dating Licenses.

A. The following types of licenses are available: ...

10. Career and Technical Education (Three-Year) License: The Career and Technical Education (Three-Year) License is a nonrenewable license issued for a three-year validity period.

- a. The Career and Technical Education (Three-Year) License is available to individuals who have been employed to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average, and who meet the following requirements:
 - (1) Submits an application in the form prescribed by the Board, that includes a recommendation for such a license from the local school board;
 - (2) Meets certain basic conditions for licensure as outlined in 8VAC20-22-40;
 - (3) Meets one of the following:
 - (i) holds, at a minimum, a baccalaureate degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education and has completed coursework in the career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach;
or
 - (ii) holds the required professional license in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach, where applicable; or
 - (iii) holds an industry certification credential, as that term is defined in § 22.1-298.1, in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach;
 - (4) Has at least four years of full-time work experience or its equivalent in the specific career and technical education subject area in which the individual seeks to teach; and
 - (5) Has obtained qualifying scores on the communication and literacy professional teacher's assessment prescribed by the Board.

b. The employing school board shall assign a mentor to supervise an individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section during the first year of teaching.

c. Except as otherwise provided in subsection d, any individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section may be granted subsequent three-year extensions of such license by the Board upon recommendation of the local school board.

a. Any individual issued a three-year license pursuant to this section who completes:

(1) nine semester hours of specialized professional studies credit from a regionally accredited institution of higher education; or (2) an alternative course of professional studies proposed by the local school board and approved by the Department of Education shall be granted a three-year extension of such license by the Board and may be granted subsequent three-year extensions of such license by the Board upon recommendation of the local school board. Any such specialized professional studies credit or alternative course of professional studies may be completed through distance learning programs and shall include human growth and development; curriculum, instructional, and technology procedures; and classroom and behavior management.

e. No three-year license issued by the Board pursuant to this section shall be deemed a provisional license or a renewable license, as those terms are defined in § 22.1-298.1.

f. Individuals issued a three-year license pursuant to this section shall not be eligible for continuing contract status while teaching under such license and shall be subject to the probationary terms of employment specified in § 22.1-303.

g. The provisions of § 22.1-299.6 and of Board regulations governing the denial, suspension, cancellation, revocation, and reinstatement of licensure shall apply to three-year licenses issued pursuant to this section.

h. The Board shall report at least triennially to the Chairmen of the House Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education and Health on the issuance of three-year licenses pursuant to this section by high school, local school division, and career and technical education subject area.

B. All licenses will be effective from July 1 in the school year in which the application is made. A Virginia employing education division or agency is required to notify employees in writing at the time of employment of the need to meet appropriate assessment requirements for licensure.

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

The Board of Education received for first review the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommended amendments to the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* to provide for the issuance of three-year licenses to qualified individuals to teach high school career and technical education courses in specific subject areas for no more than 50 percent of the instructional day or year, on average.

R. First Review of the Virginia Department of Education's Application for an Annual Waiver of the Teacher Licensure Requirements for Trade and Industrial Education Teachers to Comply with House Bill 682 of the 2016 Virginia General Assembly

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent, Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- The 2016 General Assembly passed House Bill 682 that permits any division superintendent to apply to

the Department of Education for an annual waiver of the teacher licensure requirements for any individual whom the local school board hires or seeks to hire to teach in a trade and industrial education program who has obtained or is working toward an industry credential relating to the program area and who has at least 4,000 hours of recent and relevant employment experience, as defined by the Board pursuant to regulation. The bill requires the Department to establish a procedure for submitting, receiving, and acting upon such annual waiver applications.

CHAPTER 435

An Act to amend the Code of Virginia by adding a section numbered 22.1-299.5, relating to waiver of teacher licensure requirements; trade and industrial education programs.

[\[H 682\]](#)

Approved March 11, 2016

Be it enacted by the General Assembly of Virginia:

1. That the Code of Virginia is amended by adding a section numbered 22.1-299.5 as follows:

§ 22.1-299.5. *Waiver of teacher licensure requirements; trade and industrial education programs.*

A. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, any division superintendent may apply to the Department of Education for an annual waiver of the teacher licensure requirements for any individual whom the local school board hires or seeks to hire to teach in a trade and industrial education program who has obtained or is working toward an industry credential relating to the program area and who has at least 4,000 hours of recent and relevant employment experience, as defined by the Board pursuant to regulation.

B. The Department of Education shall establish a procedure for submitting, receiving, and acting upon such annual waiver applications.

- The Department of Education must establish a procedure for submitting, receiving, and acting upon the annual waiver applications of teacher licensure requirements for individuals hired to teach in a trade and industrial education program.
- On September 19, 2016, a draft application was presented to the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure for review as follows:

**PROCEDURE FOR SUBMITTING AN ANNUAL WAIVER APPLICATION
OF TEACHER LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS
FOR TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS**

Background:

The 2016 General Assembly passed House Bill 682 that amended the statute by adding the following section to the *Code of Virginia*:

Code of Virginia, § 22.1-299.5. Waiver of teacher licensure requirements; trade and industrial education programs.

A. Notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, any division superintendent may apply to the Department of Education for an annual waiver of the teacher licensure requirements for any individual whom the local school board hires or seeks to hire to teach in a trade and industrial education program who has obtained or is working toward an industry credential relating to the program area and who has at least 4,000 hours of recent and relevant employment experience, as defined by the Board pursuant to regulation.

B. The Department of Education shall establish a procedure for submitting, receiving, and acting upon such annual waiver applications.

Signed on December 10, 2015, the *Every Student Succeeds Act* replaced the *No Child Left Behind Act*. This federal law requires, in part, the following:

Every Student Succeeds Act

Section 1111(g)(2)(J)

(2) Each State plan shall contain assurances that --

... “(J) the State educational agency will ensure that all teachers and paraprofessionals working in a program supported with funds under this part meet applicable State certification and licensure requirements, including any requirements for certification obtained through alternative routes to certification; ...”

Section 1112

e) PARENTS RIGHT-TO-KNOW.—

(1) INFORMATION FOR PARENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—At the beginning of each school year, a local educational agency that receives funds under this part shall notify the parents of each student attending any school receiving funds under this part that the parents may request, and the agency will provide the parents on request (and in a timely manner), information regarding the professional qualifications of the student’s classroom teachers, including at a minimum, the following:

(i) Whether the student’s teacher—

(I) has met State qualification and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction;

(II) is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which State qualification or licensing criteria have been waived; and

(III) is teaching in the field of discipline of the certification of the teacher.

(ii) Whether the child is provided services by paraprofessionals and, if so, their qualifications....

Submission of Request:

A Virginia school division superintendent may apply to the Department of Education for an annual waiver of teacher licensure requirements who meets specified criteria. Submission of an application for the waiver must include the following:

- ☐ Application for a Virginia License (if the individual does not already hold a valid Virginia license);
- ☐ Documentation of the completion of (1) child abuse recognition and intervention training and (2) emergency first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, and the use of an automated external defibrillator Training;
- ☐ Verification that the school board is hiring or seeks to hire the applicant in a trade and industrial education program;
- ☐ Verification of an industry credential or evidence from the credentialing entity that the individual is working toward the industry credential; and
- ☐ Documentation of at least two years or 4,000 clock hours of satisfactory occupational experience within the past five years in the teaching specialty for which endorsement is sought. [Please note that individuals whose experience requires a professional license to practice must hold such active Virginia license.]

The application may request a waiver of the following licensure requirements:

- ☐ Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel;
- ☐ Human growth and development: three semester hours;

- ☐ Curriculum and instructional procedures in career and technical education: three semester hours; and
- ☐ Applications of instructional technology or classroom and behavior management: three semester hours.

The application must be submitted to the Division of Teacher Education and Licensure, Virginia Department of Education, P. O. Box 2120, Richmond, Virginia 23218-2120. The school division is to notify the teacher of the waiver request

**APPLICATION FOR AN ANNUAL WAIVER
OF TEACHER LICENSURE REQUIREMENTS
FOR A TRADE AND INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION TEACHER**

Name of School Division

Name of Teacher

Address:

City/Zip

License Number, if applicable

Teaching Assignment

Please check the documents attached:

- ☐ Application for a Virginia License (if the individual does not already hold a valid Virginia license);
- ☐ Documentation of the completion of Child Abuse Recognition and Intervention Training and Emergency first aid, cardiopulmonary resuscitation, and the use of an automated external defibrillator Training;
- ☐ Verification that the school board is hiring or seeks to hire the applicant in a trade and industrial education program;
- ☐ Verification of an industry credential or evidence from the credentialing entity that the individual is working toward the industry credential; and
- ☐ Documentation of at least two years or 4,000 clock hours of satisfactory occupational experience within the past five years in the teaching specialty for which endorsement is sought. [Please note that individuals whose experience requires a professional license to practice must hold such active Virginia license.]

Certification:

By my signature, I am requesting a waiver of the following licensure requirements for the _____ school year for the teacher named on this application who my local board is hiring or seeks to hire for a trade and industrial education program.

Please check the licensure requirements for which the annual waiver is requested:

- ☐ Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel;
- ☐ Human growth and development: three semester hours;
- ☐ Curriculum and instructional procedures in career and technical education: three semester hours; and
- ☐ Applications of instructional technology or classroom and behavior management: three semester hours.

Signature, Division Superintendent

Name of Division Superintendent

Date

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Atkinson asked if the VDOE has discretion in granting the waiver request. Mrs. Pitts noted that if the division superintendent requests the waiver, the VDOE will approve it as long as all requirements are met.
- Mrs. Lodal asked if this process could be a model for individuals coming out of technical industries who might want to enter teaching in mathematics and science. Mrs. Pitts indicated that a waiver for such individuals is not available, but individuals with the content background can test out in a subject area and the requesting school division can develop a professional development delivery system for them rather than having to take course work and submit it to the VDOE for consideration.
- Mrs. Lodal asked about the capacity of small school divisions to develop professional development delivery systems. Mrs. Pitts and Dr. Staples noted that some localities have been having discussions about ways to develop a regional plan for a professional development system, perhaps with community colleges. Dr. Staples indicated the importance of addressing alternate options for teacher recruitment and licensure, especially in critical shortage areas.
- Mrs. Lodal expressed an interest in asking the General Assembly to introduce legislation to enable a waiver process for teaching areas other than trade and industrial education.
- Dr. Cannaday was pleased with the interest in alternate ways to recruit and attract teachers in critical shortage areas. He asked VDOE staff to offer some suggestion on alternate pathways that can be used for teacher licensure. Mrs. Pitts indicated she would provide some examples of such pathways, noting that the *Licensure Regulations for School Personnel* offer flexibility and often allow options that school divisions are unaware of.
- Dr. Staples noted that the VDOE is examining ways to provide a statewide professional development delivery system to assist areas that may not have the capacity to do so on their own.

The Board of Education received for first review the Virginia Department of Education's application process and form for the annual waiver applications of licensure requirements for individuals hired to teach in a trade and industrial education program.

S. First Review of Nominations to Fill Vacancies on the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure

Mrs. Melissa Luchau, director for board relations, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Article Nine, Section 2 of the Board of Education's bylaws states the following:

Section 2. Advisory Committees. Advisory committees may be created by the Board for special purposes to include, but not be limited to, federal and state-mandated committees. An advisory committee shall be composed of persons who represent the views and interests of the general public and who are known to be qualified to perform their duties. Personnel of the Department of Education may be appointed to the committee, as members or as consultants. Unless otherwise prescribed by

state or federal law or regulations, all appointments to an advisory committee shall be made by the Board upon the recommendations of the Superintendent of Public Instruction...

- The Board of Education's bylaws also specify the membership and term of service in Article Fifteen, Section 3 and 4, as follows:

Section 3. Membership. The Board shall determine the number of members to serve on an advisory committee, and shall appoint the members of the committee, as specified in Board bylaws under Article 9, Section 2, except as provided by state or federal law or regulation. Nominations for all vacant positions will be solicited as widely as practicable and on forms provided by the Virginia Department of Education. Members of advisory committees shall not receive compensation for their service, but may be reimbursed for travel expenses in accordance with state travel guidelines set forth by the Department of Accounts. The Board, at its discretion, may appoint a member of the Board to serve as a liaison to the advisory committee.

Section 4. Term of Service. Appointments to an advisory committee shall be for a term of three years. Members of an advisory committee may be re-appointed, with no member serving more than two consecutive three-year terms. Any vacancies shall be filled by the Board.

- The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure has four vacant positions. Specific categories of expertise are required by the *Code of Virginia*.
 - **Public School Classroom Teacher (Secondary)**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
Priority consideration will be given to Regions 3 and 6
 - **Public School Principal**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017
Priority consideration will be given to middle and secondary principals and to Regions 3, 7, and 8.
 - **Nonpublic School Teacher**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018
 - **Business Community**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
- Superintendent's Memorandum #243-16, dated September 23, 2016, announced the call for nominations to fill the advisory committee vacancies. The call for nominations was shared with school divisions, education associations - particularly teacher, principal, and private school organizations - the Virginia Chamber of Commerce, and individuals who asked to be notified of the Board's business.
- Following the close of the nomination period, the nominations were reviewed by Virginia Department of Education staff. Persons recommended for appointment are selected based upon qualifications, and on the required categories for membership.
- The list of nominees recommended for appointment is as follows:

Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure

- **Public School Classroom Teacher (Secondary)**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
Dr. Willie C. Sherman
Pittsylvania County Schools

- **Public School Principal**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017
Dr. Travis Burns
Northumberland County Schools
- **Nonpublic School Teacher**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018
Brian J. McGovern
Peninsula Catholic High School
- **Business Community**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
Dr. Garry Wayne Carter, Jr.
Newport News Shipbuilding

Board discussion:

- There was no discussion.

Mrs. Lodal made a motion to waive first review and approve the recommended nominees to fill vacancies on the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and approved unanimously. The new appointments are as follows:

- **Public School Classroom Teacher (Secondary)**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
Dr. Willie C. Sherman
Pittsylvania County Schools
- **Public School Principal**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2017
Dr. Travis Burns
Northumberland County Schools
- **Nonpublic School Teacher**
Term: To fill the unexpired term of July 1, 2015 – June 30, 2018
Brian J. McGovern
Peninsula Catholic High School
- **Business Community**
Term: July 1, 2016 – June 30, 2019
Dr. Garry Wayne Carter, Jr.
Newport News Shipbuilding

T. First Review of Model Policy Regarding Political Candidates and Public Officials and Model Policy Regarding Controversial Issues

Mrs. Melissa Luchau, director for board relations, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- § 30-348 of the *Code of Virginia* establishes the Virginia Commission on Civics Education and its membership as follows:

§ 30-348. (Expires July 1, 2017) Commission on Civics Education; purpose; membership; terms. The Commission on Civics Education (the Commission) is established in the legislative branch of state government. The purposes of the Commission are to (i) educate students on the importance of citizen

involvement in a constitutional republic, (ii) promote the study of state and local government among the Commonwealth's citizenry, and (iii) enhance communication and collaboration among organizations in the Commonwealth that conduct civics education.

The Commission shall have a total membership of 15 members that shall consist of eight legislative members, six nonlegislative citizen members, and one ex officio member. Members shall be appointed as follows: five members of the House of Delegates, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Delegates in accordance with the principles of proportional representation contained in the Rules of the House of Delegates; three members of the Senate, to be appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules; three nonlegislative citizen members, one of whom shall have a background in curriculum development, interactive learning, and multimedia technology, one of whom shall be a current or retired school civics teacher, and one of whom shall be a representative of an organization that promotes civic learning, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Delegates; and three nonlegislative citizen members, one of whom shall be a retired school civics teacher, one of whom shall be a representative of a public policy center of a public institution of higher education in the Commonwealth, and one of whom shall be a representative of the Virginia Press Association, to be appointed by the Senate Committee on Rules. The Superintendent of Public Instruction or his designee shall serve ex officio with voting privileges. Nonlegislative citizen members of the Commission shall be citizens of the Commonwealth. Unless otherwise approved in writing by the chairman of the Commission, the Clerk of the House of Delegates, and the Clerk of the Senate, nonlegislative citizen members shall only be reimbursed for travel originating and ending within the Commonwealth for the purpose of attending meetings.

- The Virginia Commission on Civics Education is dedicated to educating students on the importance of citizen involvement in a constitutional republic, promoting the study of state and local government among the Commonwealth's citizenry, and enhancing communication and collaboration among organizations in the Commonwealth that conduct civics education. The Commission felt that teachers need clear guidance in the areas of political campaigns and controversial issues. A team of former Virginia and U.S. Government teachers and Social Studies Supervisors drafted the following proposed model policies. The Commission requested the Board of Education to share the model policies with local school divisions, with the hope that local school boards would determine if the model policies are of value in reviewing their current policies.

Model Policy Regarding Political Candidates and Public Officials

Purpose

To provide guidelines for school-based and non-school-based administrators, teachers, and students for dealing with political campaigns in a school setting.

Philosophy

The preparation for effective citizenship requires that schools provide opportunities for students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required to meet the challenges of self-government. Learning how to engage with the issues, candidates, and events that animate our political system can serve as the basis for powerful civic learning experiences for students. Schools should encourage students to participate in political campaigns, to meet with public officials, and to engage with issues in a way that develops critical thinking skills and fosters a respect for divergent opinions. Students should be encouraged to become full, active participants in the decision-making process.

Role of the Teacher

Teachers dedicated to preparing their students for effective and engaged citizenship are encouraged to:

- Provide activities and experiences that enable students to become informed participants in the political process.
- Expect that students will participate directly in the political process by supporting the candidate(s) and issue(s) of their choice.
- Introduce students to elected and appointed government officials.
- Require that students attend, or otherwise observe, public meetings of officials at the local, state, and national levels.
- Work with students to translate civic education into community engagement.

Political Candidates and Public Officials in the School Setting

All invitations must be approved by the principal, or the principal's designee.

If a candidate for office is to be invited to meet with students, the opportunity to meet students must be provided to other candidates running for that office in a fair and impartial fashion.

Students should be given the opportunity to question the candidate(s) or officeholder(s) in a manner that is respectful of differing opinions.

Distribution and Display of Campaign Literature in the School Setting

The principal, or the principal's designee, shall determine the appropriate time, place, and manner for distribution and/or display of campaign literature in the school setting.

Model Policy Regarding Controversial Issues

Purpose

To provide guidelines for school-based and non-school-based administrators, teachers, and students in dealing with controversial issues in ways that develop critical thinking skills and reflect sensitivity to the emotions often engendered by such issues.

Philosophy

The preparation for effective citizenship includes the study of issues that are controversial. The study of controversial issues shall be conducted in an atmosphere in which knowledge can be freely imparted and the critical thinking of students can be developed through research and classroom discussion within the guidelines of the instructional program.

Role of the Teacher

An issue is controversial when there are substantial differences of opinion about it on the interpersonal, local, national, or international level and when these differences of opinion are accompanied by intense feelings and strong emotions on the part of individuals or groups.

Teachers should use the following guidelines in dealing with controversial issues in the instructional

program:

Address controversial topics as impartially and objectively as possible. Do not allow personal biases or personal beliefs to interfere with professional judgment.

Handle controversial issues in a manner relevant to the content of the course and appropriate to the knowledge and maturity of the students.

When there is doubt about the impact of a controversial issue in planned instruction, the teacher should consult with the principal, or the principal's designee, and provide a brief outline of the instructional strategies that will be used to ensure objectivity, fairness, accuracy, and relevance to the objectives of the instructional program.

Encourage critical thinking by offering multiple perspectives on the issues under discussion, gathering information and evidence from diverse sources, considering implications and consequences of varying viewpoints, checking for assumptions, and using questions to guide ideas and clarify thinking.

Do not require that students will reach agreement. Agreement is not a necessary outcome when students engage with controversial issues. Learning to discuss controversial issues in a civil manner that promotes intellectual integrity and preserves personal dignity is expected.

Be sensitive to students with heightened feelings and emotions engendered by a controversial issue proposed for discussion.

Speakers on Controversial Issues

All invitations to guest speakers on controversial issues must be approved by the principal, or the principal's designee. The teacher, student, or student group who proposes to extend invitations must outline for the principal, or the principal's designee, the following:

- The expected contribution of the speakers to the instructional program.
- Plans for preliminary and follow-up discussions and activities designed to help students put each speaker's views into context and perspective.
- Provisions for fair treatment of the views of each speaker and of differing opinions.
- The intended audience for each speaker's remarks.

Teachers should discuss with the principal, or the principal's designee, the advisability of informing parents about invitations extended to speakers who will address controversial issues.

Students from other classes who have not been involved in preliminary activities should not attend the presentation without the approval of the principal, or the principal's designee.

When guest speakers are scheduled for presentation other than in a regular class setting, the principal, or the principal's designee, will determine the appropriateness of the proposed forum for the presentation.

Distribution and Display of Literature about Controversial Issues

The principal, or the principal's designee, shall determine the appropriate time, place, and manner for the distribution and/or display of materials about controversial issues.

Materials advocating specific violent tactics and/or disruption of government functions are not allowed. Expression of student opinion may not be used to present material that is obscene or slanderous; defames character; or advocates violation of federal, state, or local laws or school policies, rules, or regulations.

Board discussion:

- Dr. Cannaday indicated that given public comment related to the policies, the VDOE would send the policies out for public comment, followed by a recommendation from Board members on how to proceed.

The Board of Education received for first review the Model Policy Regarding Political Candidates and Public Officials and the Model Policy Regarding Controversial Issues.

REPORTS

U. Annual Progress Report on Memoranda of Understanding as Required for Schools in Accreditation Denied Status for Alexandria City Public Schools, Danville City Public Schools, Dinwiddie County Public Schools, Essex County Public Schools, Hampton City Public Schools, Henrico County Public Schools, Newport News City Public Schools, Norfolk City Public Schools, Portsmouth City Public Schools, Richmond City Public Schools, and Staunton City Public Schools

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, made this presentation. The presentation included the following:

- Section 8 VAC 20-131-315 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) requires certain actions for schools that are denied accreditation:

- A. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-300 shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and shall provide parents of enrolled students and other interested parties with the following:
1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;
 2. A copy of the school division's proposed corrective action plan, including a timeline for implementation, to improve the school's accreditation rating; and
 3. An opportunity to comment on the division's proposed corrective action plan. Such public comment shall be received and considered by the school division prior to finalizing the school's corrective action plan and a Board of Education memorandum of understanding with the local school board.
- B. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with [8 VAC 20-131-300](#) shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and affirmed through a memorandum of understanding between the Board of Education and the local school board. The local school board shall submit a corrective action plan to the Board of Education for its consideration in prescribing actions in the memorandum of understanding within 45 days of the notification of the rating. The memorandum of understanding shall be entered into no later than November 1 of the academic year in which the rating is awarded.

The local board shall submit status reports detailing implementation of actions prescribed by the memorandum of understanding to the Board of Education. The status reports shall be signed by the school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board. The school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board may be required to appear before the Board of Education to present status reports.

The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:

1. Undergoing an educational service delivery and management review. The Board of Education shall prescribe the content of such review and approve the reviewing authority retained by the school division.
2. Employing a turnaround specialist credentialed by the state to address those conditions at the school that may impede educational progress and effectiveness and academic success.

- The following schools are in *Accreditation Denied* status for 2016-2017 and are subject to actions prescribed by the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) and affirmed through an MOU between the VBOE and the local school boards. The MOUs for Jefferson-Houston Elementary, Lindenwood Elementary School, and William H. Ruffner Middle School are on a different template because they were developed prior to the current MOU template.

Name of Division	Name of Schools in <i>Accreditation Denied</i> Status
Alexandria City Public Schools	Jefferson-Houston Elementary School
Danville City Public Schools	Woodberry Hills Elementary School
Dinwiddie County Public Schools	Dinwiddie Middle School
Essex County Public Schools	Essex High School
Hampton City Public Schools	A.W. E. Bassette Elementary School
Henrico County Public Schools	L. Douglas Wilder Middle School
Newport News City Public Schools	Mary Passage Middle School
Newport News City Public Schools	Newsome Park Elementary School
Newport News City Public Schools	Sedgefield Elementary School
Newport News City Public Schools	Willis Jenkins Elementary School
Norfolk City Public Schools	Lake Taylor Middle School
Norfolk City Public Schools	Lindenwood Elementary School
Norfolk City Public Schools	P. B. Young, Sr. Elementary School
Norfolk City Public Schools	Southside STEM Academy at Campostella
Norfolk City Public Schools	William H. Ruffner Middle School
Norfolk City Public Schools	Tidewater Park Elementary School
Portsmouth City Public Schools	Churchland Middle School
Richmond City Public Schools	Armstrong High School
Richmond City Public Schools	Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School
Richmond City Public Schools	Patrick Henry School of Arts and Sciences
Richmond City Public Schools	Richmond Alternative School
Staunton City Public Schools	Bessie Weller Elementary School

Technical Assistance

- All schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will participate in technical assistance sessions provided by the Office of School Improvement (OSI). OSI technical assistance sessions for the 2016-2017 school year will focus on the comprehensive needs assessment component of continuous school improvement planning. Additionally, schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will have triannual meetings with OSI, the support of an OSI contractor, and the opportunity to select from the newly developed OSI/VDOE

Technical Assistance Menu. Schools rated *Accreditation Denied* that did not make progress toward full accreditation will be required to participate in the applicable Technical Assistance Menu sessions.

- Using research-based indicators that lead to increased student achievement is imperative for school improvement. Schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will provide quarterly data reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI) on mutually determined school-level data points. Divisions will meet triannually with the Office of School Improvement to review quarterly report data and collaboratively determine next steps.

Board discussion:

- Mrs. Lodal asked about the criteria used in the root cause analysis. Mrs. Rabil noted that the root cause analysis is specific to eight domains, including school leadership.
- Mrs. Lodal asked how the information resulting from the root cause analysis is communicated back to the local school board. Mrs. Rabil noted that school division superintendents must deliver a monthly report to the local school board.
- Dr. Staples noted that the new style memoranda of understanding allows the VDOE to engage directly with local school boards regarding their progress reports.
- Mrs. Lodal asked about why a local Richmond City school board member would come to the state board as had occurred during the public comment period. She also asked about the role state board members might play in engaging with local school members.
- Dr. Staples noted that some communication gap may exist in Richmond City. There may be some confusion between the Efficiency Review and the Division-Level Review. The VDOE Office of School Improvement is working with Dr. James Stronge from The College of William and Mary to build a self-guided instrument that approximates a division-level review for school divisions that may not yet qualify for a state-conducted division-level review.

The Board of Education received the annual progress report for Jefferson Houston Elementary School, Alexandria City Public Schools; Woodberry Hills Elementary School, Danville City Public Schools; Dinwiddie Middle School, Dinwiddie County Public Schools; Essex High School, Essex County Public Schools; A. W. E. Bassette Elementary School, Hampton City Public Schools; L. Douglas Wilder Middle School, Henrico County Public Schools; Mary Passage Middle School, Newsome Park Elementary School, Sedgefield Elementary School, and Willis Jenkins Elementary School, Newport News City Public Schools; Lake Taylor Middle School, Lindenwood Elementary School, P. B. Young, Sr. Elementary School, William H. Ruffner Middle School, Southside STEM Academy at Campostella, and Tidewater Park Elementary School, Norfolk City Public Schools; Churchland Middle School, Portsmouth City Public Schools, Armstrong High School, Martin Luther King, Jr. Middle School, Patrick Henry School of Arts and Sciences, and Richmond Alternative School, Richmond City Public Schools and Bessie Weller Elementary School, Staunton City Public Schools as required for schools in *Accreditation Denied* status.

V. Annual Progress Report on Memoranda of Understanding as Required for Divisions under Division-Level Review for Franklin City Public Schools and Sussex County Public Schools

Ms. Beverly Rabil, director, Office of School Improvement, Division of Student Assessment and School Improvement, presented this item. The presentation included the following:

- Section 8 VAC 20-131-315 of the *Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia* (SOA) requires certain actions for schools that are denied accreditation:

- A. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-300 shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and shall provide parents of enrolled students and other interested parties with the following:
1. Written notice of the school's accreditation rating within 30 calendar days of the notification of the rating from the Department of Education;
 2. A copy of the school division's proposed corrective action plan, including a timeline for implementation, to improve the school's accreditation rating; and
 3. An opportunity to comment on the division's proposed corrective action plan. Such public comment shall be received and considered by the school division prior to finalizing the school's corrective action plan and a Board of Education memorandum of understanding with the local school board.
- B. Any school rated Accreditation Denied in accordance with 8 VAC 20-131-300 shall be subject to actions prescribed by the Board of Education and affirmed through a memorandum of understanding between the Board of Education and the local school board. The local school board shall submit a corrective action plan to the Board of Education for its consideration in prescribing actions in the memorandum of understanding within 45 days of the notification of the rating. The memorandum of understanding shall be entered into no later than November 1 of the academic year in which the rating is awarded.

The local board shall submit status reports detailing implementation of actions prescribed by the memorandum of understanding to the Board of Education. The status reports shall be signed by the school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board. The school principal, division superintendent, and the chair of the local school board may be required to appear before the Board of Education to present status reports.

The memorandum of understanding may also include but not be limited to:

1. Undergoing an educational service delivery and management review. The Board of Education shall prescribe the content of such review and approve the reviewing authority retained by the school division.
2. Employing a turnaround specialist credentialed by the state to address those conditions at the school that may impede educational progress and effectiveness and academic success.

Franklin City Public Schools

- On October 24, 2013, the Virginia Board of Education (VBOE) placed Franklin City Public Schools in division-level academic review status and authorized the Department of Education to begin the review process. The division-level review process was conducted December 1-5, 2013.
- On March 27, 2014, the VBOE approved a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Franklin City School Board and the VBOE. The MOU, subject to annual review and revisions by the Board of Education, will remain in effect until all Franklin City Public Schools are *Fully Accredited*.
- On April 24, 2014, the VBOE announced that it would conduct a public hearing in Franklin City Public Schools to obtain input from constituents in Franklin City on the proposed corrective action plan. The public hearing was held on May 14, 2014, at Joseph P. King Middle School, and a report on this public hearing was submitted to the VBOE on May 22, 2014.
- The corrective action plan, submitted at the June 26, 2014, Virginia Board of Education included all essential actions noted in the MOU and indicated whether the essential action requires immediate priority or systemic action over a longer period of time, as well as essential actions offered by the department and the VBOE at

the April 24, 2014, and May 22, 2014, meetings.

- While the Board noted that it was imperative that the corrective action plan be approved with all due speed, it was also apparent from their comments at the public hearing that the citizens of Franklin City Public Schools wanted more input into the development of the plan. The June 2014 approved corrective action plan was in effect from June 26, 2014 to November 30, 2014. During that time, the new superintendent and the Franklin City School Board were to form a committee to amend the corrective action plan to include additional essential actions that addressed the comments from the public hearing held on May 14, 2014, by the VBOE. The committee was to meet to finalize the corrective action plan and present a final corrective action plan for approval by the Franklin City School Board by October 17, 2014. The amended corrective action plan, developed based on input from the community committee, was submitted to the VBOE on November 7, 2014.
- At the November 20, 2014, VBOE meeting, the board provided direction to the Franklin superintendent requesting that the current plan be further amended to identify incremental steps needed to reach established goals, strategies used to meet the incremental steps, and metrics for determining progress toward the goals.
- At the January 21, 2015, meeting of the VBOE Committee on School and Division Accountability, a report on Franklin's progress in responding to the direction provided by the VBOE at the November 2014 meeting was presented. Following the January 2015 meeting, the VBOE provided additional direction on the steps Franklin City should take in amending the corrective action plan. After completing the additional steps, targeted essential actions for the corrective action plan were approved by the VBOE on March 26, 2015. The following chart contains an overview of school accreditation data for Franklin City Public Schools for the current school year and the previous two school years.

School Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited First Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Second Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Third Year	Number of Partially Accredited: Reconstituted Schools	Number of Schools Denied Accreditation	Total Number Not Fully Accredited	Total Number of Schools	Percent Not Fully Accredited
2016-2017	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	66.67%
2015-2016	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	66.67%
2014-2015	0	0	2	0	0	2	3	66.67%

Sussex County Public Schools

- Sussex County Public Schools was identified for division-level review status in 2004 and entered into an initial MOU with the VBOE. On September 17, 2009, Sussex County Public Schools appeared before the VBOE to enter into a second MOU for Sussex County Public Schools. This MOU was in effect until all schools were *Fully Accredited* or the VBOE released Sussex County Public Schools from the MOU.
- In 2013-2014, Sussex County Public Schools consolidated its elementary and middle schools and closed three schools. Sussex County Public Schools now has three schools on one campus: Sussex Central Elementary School, grades K-5; Sussex Central Middle School, grades 6-8; and Sussex Central High School, grades 9-12. Because of the change in school configuration, an updated corrective action plan and MOU were required. The following chart contains an overview of school accreditation data for Sussex County Public Schools for the current school year and the previous two school years.

School Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited First Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Second Year	Number of Schools Not Fully Accredited Third Year	Number of Partially Accredited: Reconstituted Schools	Number of Schools Denied Accreditation	Total Number Not Fully Accredited	Total Number of Schools	Percent Not Fully Accredited
2016-2017	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	33.33%
2015-2016	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	33.33%
2014-2015	2	1	0	0	0	3	3	100%

Technical Assistance

- Franklin City Public Schools and Sussex County Public Schools will participate in technical assistance sessions provided by the Office of School Improvement (OSI). OSI technical assistance sessions for the 2016-2017 school year will focus on the comprehensive needs assessment component of continuous school improvement planning. Additionally, divisions with a division-level memorandum of understanding and corrective action plan will have triannual meetings with OSI, the support of an OSI contractor, and the opportunity to select from the newly developed OSI/VDOE Technical Assistance Menu. Divisions that did not make progress toward full accreditation may have additional meetings with OSI in order to determine appropriate next steps.
- Using research-based indicators that lead to increased student achievement is imperative for school improvement. Schools rated *Accreditation Denied* will provide quarterly data reports to the Office of School Improvement (OSI) on mutually determined school-level data points. Divisions will meet triannually with the Office of School Improvement to review quarterly report data and collaboratively determine next steps.

Board discussion:

- Dr. Staples noted media coverage around fiscal issues in Franklin City. Franklin City Council has asked the VDOE to work with them regarding these issues.

The Board of Education received the annual progress reports for Franklin City Public Schools and Sussex County Public Schools as required for divisions under a division-level Memorandum of Understanding.

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

There was no discussion of current issues.

DINNER MEETING

The Board met for a public dinner on Wednesday, October 26, 2016, at 6:00 p.m., at the Berkley Hotel with the following members present: Mrs. Atkinson, Dr. Baysal, Mr. Bellamy, Dr. Cannaday, Mr. Dillard, Mrs. Lodol, Mr. Romero, and Mrs. Wodiska. The following department staff also attended: Dr. Steven Staples, superintendent of public instruction, and Melissa Luchau, director of board relations. Members discussed pending Board agenda items. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 7:30 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion to go into executive session under *Virginia Code* §2.2-3711(A)(41), for the purpose of discussion and consideration of records relating to denial, suspension, or revocation of teacher licenses, and that Mona Siddiqui, legal counsel to the Virginia Board of Education; as well as staff members Dr. Steven Staples, Patty Pitts, Nancy Walsh, Chris Fillmore, and John Brooks, whose presence will aid in this matter, participate in the closed meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bellamy and carried unanimously. The Board went into Executive Session at 2:45 p.m.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dillard and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 3:54 p.m.

Mrs. Wodiska made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements of the Freedom of Information Act were discussed and (2) only matters identified in the motion to have the closed session were discussed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bellamy and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Mr. Bellamy – Yes
Mrs. Lodal – Yes
Mr. Dillard – Yes
Mrs. Wodiska – Yes
Dr. Cannaday – Yes
Mrs. Atkinson – Yes
Dr. Baysal – Yes
Mr. Romero – Yes
Mr. Gecker – Yes

The Board made the following motions:

- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to revoke the license of Kelly Carol Cosby. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Atkinson and carried unanimously.
- Dr. Cannaday made a motion to deny a license to Brandie Marie Speight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Bellamy and carried unanimously

ADJOURNMENT OF THE BUSINESS SESSION

There being no further business of the Board of Education, Dr. Cannaday adjourned the meeting at 3:57 p.m.



President